

THE Anti-Slavery Reporter.

Published under the sanction of the
British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society.

Series 4.
Vol. XV., No. 3. }

SEPTEMBER to NOVEMBER, 1895.

{ PRICE 6d. POST FREE
{ GRATIS TO SUBSCRIBERS

SPECIAL MANSION HOUSE MEETING NUMBER.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
SLAVERY UNDER THE BRITISH FLAG—	
GREAT PUBLIC MEETING AT THE MANSION HOUSE (Convened by the BRITISH AND FOREIGN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY)	147
ADDRESS OF CHAIRMAN (MR. ARTHUR PEASE, M.P.)	149
LETTER FROM MR. THOMAS BAYLEY, M.P. (Chesterfield)	150
ADDRESS OF MR. DONALD MACKENZIE (Special Commissioner to Zanzibar and Pemba)	152
SPEAKERS:—MR. JOSEPH A. PEASE, M.P.	161
MR. BOSWORTH SMITH	163
MR. C. ERNEST TRITTON, M.P.	165
REV. HORACE WALLER	165
MR. E. WRIGHT BROOKS	166
DR. LEITNER, MR. W. H. WYLDE, C.M.G., MR. W. WILBER- FORCE BAYNES, MR. W. H. LEFEVRE, REV. PAULUS MOORT, M.D.	167
OPINIONS OF THE PRESS... ..	168-183
THE STATUS OF ZANZIBAR SLAVERY AND SOME CONSEQUENCES (REV. HORACE WALLER)	183
LETTER TO THE "DAILY NEWS" (MR. D. MACKENZIE)	185
CORRESPONDENCE—MR. PIGOTT TO MR. C. H. ALLEN	186
MR. MACKENZIE TO MR. C. H. ALLEN	187
NOTE TO THE ABOVE	193
A PRO-SLAVERY ARGUMENT	188-203
ARTICLES IN "PALL MALL GAZETTE," WITH COMMENTS FROM MR. DONALD MACKENZIE, REV. HORACE WALLER, AND MR. C. H. ALLEN.	
THE INTERNATIONAL LAW ASSOCIATION AND SLAVERY—MR. J. G. ALEXANDER	203-208

PUBLISHED AT THE OFFICES OF THE SOCIETY,
55, NEW BROAD STREET, LONDON, E.C.

The British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society.

PATRON:

H.R.H. The PRINCE of WALES.

PRESIDENT.
ARTHUR PEASE, Esq., M.P.

VICE-PRESIDENT.
SIR THOMAS FOWELL BUXTON, Bart., K.C.M.G.

TREASURER.
JOSEPH ALLEN, Esq.

COMMITTEE.

ARTHUR ALBRIGHT, Esq.
J. G. ALEXANDER, Esq., LL.B.
WILLIAM ALLEN, Esq.
W. WILBERFORCE BAYNES, Esq.
G. BINYON, Esq.
J. BEVAN BRAITHWAITE, Esq.
E. WRIGHT BROOKS, Esq.
CEPHAS BUTLER, Esq.
SYDNEY BUXTON, Esq., M.P.
JOEL CADBURY, Esq.
FREDERICK CASH, Esq.
JAMES CLARK, Esq.
J. V. CRAWFORD, Esq., late Consul in Cuba.
DR. R. N. CUST, F.R.G.S.
R. W. FELKIN, Esq., M.D., F.R.G.S.
SIR FREDERIC GOLDSMID, K.C.S.I.
HENRY GURNEY, Esq.
D. HACK, Esq.
EDWARD HARRISON, Esq.
CALEB R. KEMP, Esq.

J. H. LLOYD, Esq.
DONALD MACKENZIE, Esq.
W. CAREY MORGAN, Esq.
JOHN MORLAND, Esq.
ALFRED E. PEASE, Esq.
JOSEPH A. PEASE, Esq., M.P.
ARNOLD PYE-SMITH, Esq.
FRANCIS RECKITT, Esq.
RICHARD SHORE, Esq.
J. FYFE STEWART, Esq.
REV. R. WARDLAW THOMPSON.
DR. E. UNDERHILL.
REV. HORACE WALLER.
W. H. WARTON, Esq.
REV. J. O. WHITEHOUSE.
REV. J. H. WILSON, D.D.
W. H. WYLDE, Esq., C.M.G. (late of the
Foreign Office *Slave-Trade Department*).
REV. J. C. YARBOROUGH.

CORRESPONDING MEMBERS.

MONS. THE BISHOP OF ADRUMETUM.
G. T. ABRINES, Esq., Tangier, Morocco.
FRANK ALLEN, Esq., Alexandria.
FRED. ARNOT, Esq., S.W. Africa.
B. R. BALFOUR, Esq., Drogheda.
T. H. BARKER, Esq., Liverpool.
HON. H. A. BOVELL, LL.B., Barbadoes.
HON. AND REV. H. CLARK, Jamaica.
PROFESSOR E. DESCAMPS, Louvain.
DR. DUTRIEUX BEY, Paris.
PROF. H. DRUMMOND, F.R.S.E., Glasgow.
WM. GALEA, Esq., Vice-Consul, Tunis.
WILLIAM HARVEY, Esq., Ilkley.
ROBERT DRUMMOND HAY, Esq.,
H.B.M. Consul-General, Bevrout.
CAPTAIN E. C. HORE, South Seas.
G.P. HUNOT, Esq., British Vice-Consul, Saffee.
COMMISSIONER H. H. JOHNSTON, C.B.,
Nyasaland.
SEÑOR A. R. JURADO, London.
DR. F. L. de GUZMAN LOBO, Rio de Janeiro.
NOEL TEMPLE MOORE, Esq., C.M.G.,
H.B.M. Consul-General, Tripoli.
A. J. MORASSO, Esq., Tangier.

WILLIAM MORGAN, Esq., Winchester.
G. MOYNIER, Esq., Geneva.
SENHOR JOAQUIM NABUCO, Brazil.
PROF. EDOUARD NAVILLE, Geneva.
REV. PÈRE OHRWALDER, Cairo.
J. A. PAYNE, Esq., Lagos, W. Africa.
DR. PRUEN, Cheltenham.
SENHOR A. REBOUCAS, Lisbon.
DR. GERHARD ROHLFS, Weimar.
DR. A. M. ROSS, Toronto.
COMTE DE ST. GEORGE, Geneva.
REV. A. V. SCHELTEMA, Amsterdam.
DR. G. SCHWEINFURTH, Cairo.
REV. LAWRENCE SCOTT, late of Nyasa.
REV. W. G. SHELLABEAR, Singapore.
SLATIN PASHA, Cairo.
DON LUIS SORELA, Spain.
M. LE COMTE D'URSEL, Brussels.
REV. E. VANORDEN, Rio Grande do Sul.
M. COURTOIS DE VICOSE, Toulouse.
LEONARD K. WILSON, Esq., Brussels.
W. J. WILSON, Esq., Cairo.
MAJOR WINGATE, R.E., C.B., Cairo.
A. B. WYLDE, Esq., Suakin.

SECRETARY.

CHARLES H. ALLEN, F.R.G.S.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY: J. EASTOE TEALL.

Bankers: Messrs. BARCLAY, BEVAN, TRITTON & Co., 54, Lombard Street.

Offices: 55, NEW BROAD STREET, LONDON, E.C.

The Anti-Slavery Reporter.

SPECIAL MEETING NUMBER.

[The Editor, whilst grateful to all correspondents who may be kind enough to furnish him with information, desires to state that he is not responsible for the views stated by them, nor for quotations which may be inserted from other journals. The object of the REPORTER is to spread information, and articles are necessarily quoted which may contain views or statements for which their authors can alone be held responsible.]

"SLAVERY UNDER THE BRITISH FLAG."

Great Meeting at the Mansion House.

WE take the above heading from the report given by the *Daily News*, of the meeting held at the Mansion House, on October 14th, by the BRITISH AND FOREIGN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY, a report of which will be found below. We are glad that an influential London paper has boldly declared what we have long maintained virtually existed in Zanzibar and Pemba, viz., the continuance of the institution of Slavery under the British Flag. It is well known that all Slaves now in the islands of Zanzibar and Pemba who were not imported there previous to the Treaty abolishing the Slave Trade by sea, made between Great Britain and the Sultan in 1873, are illegally held according to Zanzibar law. The fact, therefore, remains clear that but a very small number, if any, can still remain, of the Slaves who were taken to the islands before the date named.

When, in 1890, Great Britain took over the two islands as a Protectorate, giving up for that purpose the colony of Heligoland to Germany, and relinquishing her Treaty rights in Madagascar as a sop to France, it was naturally expected that all Slaves in Zanzibar and Pemba would have been immediately set free. This, however, was not the case; and in order to assist the action taken by the BRITISH AND FOREIGN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY to obtain the abolition of the status of Slavery in possessions which had come under the British Crown, a Special Commissioner was sent out by the Society early in the present year to investigate the condition of the Slaves still working in the clove plantations of the islands, and in other forms of labour. The commissioner, Mr. DONALD MACKENZIE, returned during the summer, and issued a report, which has been laid before the public, and to which the attention of Her Majesty's Government has been specially called.

A public meeting to receive Mr. MACKENZIE, and to hear further particulars of his interesting journey, was immediately proposed, but owing to the General Election, and subsequently to the holidays, the arrangements could not be completed until the second week in October. The LORD MAYOR kindly granted the use of the Egyptian Hall, in the Mansion House, and it was hoped that he would have taken the chair himself. His Lordship having declined to preside, the chair was taken by the Society's President, Mr. ARTHUR PEASE, M.P., and nearly all the speakers were members of the Committee of the Society. The result proved that the Society has lost none of the hold which it has so long maintained upon the thinking portion of the public at large, the room being well filled, the Society of Friends, and members of City business houses being largely and influentially represented, whilst the greatest interest was manifested in the proceedings.

Although there was very little divergence of opinion, it may be well to state that each speaker was alone responsible for the views expressed by him. The question of compensation unexpectedly raised by Mr. BOSWORTH SMITH does not, of course, come within the constitution of the BRITISH AND FOREIGN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY, nor did it appear to meet with the approval of the meeting, Mr. WALLER's disclaimer, and that of the well-known authority on Mohammedan law, Dr. LEITNER, producing general applause.

OFFICIAL REPORT OF THE MEETING.

UNDER the auspices of the BRITISH AND FOREIGN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY, a meeting was held on October 14th at the Mansion House, Mr. ARTHUR PEASE, M.P., President of the Society, in the chair, "to hear an address from Mr. DONALD MACKENZIE, late Commissioner of the Society to investigate the condition of the Slave population in the islands of Zanzibar and Pemba." There was a large attendance, and among those present were: Mr. J. A. PEASE, M.P., Mr. TRITTON, M.P., the Rev. HORACE WALLER, Dr. CUST, Dr. EVANS DARBY, Mr. H. W. WYLDE, C.M.G., Mr. J. BEVAN BRAITHWAITE, Mr. FRANCIS RECKITT, the Rev. PAULUS MOORT, M.D. (Girls' Graded Church Seminary, Liberia), Mr. R. BOSWORTH SMITH, Mr. W. TALLACK, Mr. ISAAC SHARP, Mr. W. H. LEFEVRE, Mr. CORNELIUS HANBURY, Mr. H. R. FOX BOURNE, Mr. F. W. FOX, Mr. J. G. ALEXANDER, Mr. W. W. BAYNES, Colonel GARSTIN, Mr. EDWARD HARRISON, Mr. A. B. WYLDE, Mr. C. H. PLEVINS, Mr. E. ALEXANDER, Mrs. RICHARDSON, Miss TRITTON, Mrs. BOSWORTH SMITH (Harrow) and Miss SMITH, Mr. J. D. APPLETON and Mrs. APPLETON, General and Mrs. TREMENHEERE, Mr. ROBERT SMITH, Mr. GEORGE BARRITT, The Hon. C. C. COLBY (Canada) and Miss COLBY, Messrs. T. D. CHARLESWORTH & Co. (London and Zanzibar),

Rev. G. PIERCY, Rev. G. W. LINNECAR, Mr. P. ANDERSON (London Chamber of Commerce), Mr. JAMES CHAMBERS (Vice-President London Chamber of Commerce), Mr. J. M. MACLEOD, Mr. CHARLES MORLAND, Miss M. E. BECK, Mr. W. RANSOM (Hitchin), Mr. W. C. ALLEN, Mrs. C. H. ALLEN, The Misses M. L. and B. ALLEN, Mr. and Mrs. B. M. ALLEN, Rev. J. HUNT COOKE and Miss COOKE, Mr. MOSES, Mr. C. J. WHITTINGTON, Mr. ROBINSON, Sen., Mrs. A. RUMILLY, The Misses HORSNAILL, Mr. E. WRIGHT BROOKS, Dr. G. W. LEITNER and Mrs. LEITNER, Mr. ARNOLD PYE-SMITH, Mr. HENRY GURNEY, Rev. J. KIRKMAN, Rev. JOHN KINGDON (Jamaica), Mrs. KINGDON and Daughter and Niece, Mr. A. KINGDON and Mrs. KINGDON, Mr. L. E. NEWNHAM, B.A., Mr. JOSEPH KING, Mr. HULBERT, Mr. R. BUTTERWORTH, Mr. and Mrs. O'NEILL, Miss STABLE, Miss MARTIN, Mrs. WILLIAM GARNETT and the PRINCESS SAROGINI CHATTOPADYAY, of Hyderabad, Mr. J. B. and the Misses TYLOR, Mrs. BERNARD QUARITCH, Miss QUARITCH, Mrs. J. EASTOE TEALL, Mr. G. RAYNOR, Mr. R. BROOKES, Mr. A. BROOKES (North-West Africa Company), Mr. CHAS. H. ALLEN (Secretary), Mr. J. EASTOE TEALL (Assistant Secretary), and many others.

The SECRETARY announced that letters in support of the movement had been received, amongst others, from Sir GEORGE BADEN POWELL, Sir COLIN SCOTT MONCRIEFF, Sir A. ROLLIT, M.P., Sir JOHN SIMON, Mr. PARKER SMITH, M.P., Mr. T. BAYLEY, M.P.; Sir JOHN KIRK, G.C.M.G., (who, in 1884, proposed to LORD GRANVILLE the abolition of the status of Slavery in Zanzibar, and still advocates that course), from Mr. W. A. BURDETT-COUTTS, M.P. (who said that the East Africa Company had always been in favour of the abolition of Slavery), Mr. T. FOWELL BUXTON, Sir JOHN KENNAWAY, M.P., Mr. J. H. YOXALL, M.P., Mr. HOWARD GILLIAT.

The CHAIRMAN, in opening the proceedings, after referring to the object of the Meeting, stated that the Society was established in 1839, for the purpose of bringing to an end Slavery and the Slave-trade all over the world. It had watched with the deepest interest the progress made, not only in this nation, but also in other nations, towards the extinction of these great evils. The Slave-trade had been put down on the West Coast, and of late the attention of the Society had been very much turned towards the internal Slave-trade, and the export of Slaves from the eastern coast of Africa. If anything like a correct estimate could be made of the number of Slaves in Zanzibar and Pemba, from such authorities as LIVINGSTONE, Cardinal LAVIGERIE, CAMERON, and others, they must come to the conclusion that about 2,000,000 of their fellow creatures were annually torn from their families and their homes, and that about 500,000 were sacrificed every year to the African Slave-trade, and exported as Slaves to the East Coast of Africa, which, in 1890, was placed under the absolute control of Great Britain. They felt that this country was now responsible for the evil in connection with Zanzibar and its dependencies. In 1893 the Society presented a Memorial to LORD ROSEBERY, who spoke very favourably when they

addressed him on the establishment of a railway to Uganda, and he made the memorable remark that there must be continuity in the moral policy of England. (Hear, hear.) In the early part of this year a debate on Slavery in Zanzibar was opened in the House of Commons by Mr. JOSEPH A. PEASE, now in this hall—(cheers)—(and the author of a paper, entitled "How we Countenance Slavery")—and Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT, then Chancellor of the Exchequer, said that his colleagues and he accepted the view that it was their duty to use their exertions at the earliest possible moment to put an end to Slavery. (Hear, hear.) Sir EDWARD GREY, speaking as Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs, added that before the session began the Government sent out instructions to their representatives on the spot to report what steps would be the best to put an end to Slavery in Zanzibar and Pemba. The thing had got to be done, said the Under-Secretary. (Cheers.) Knowing that England had no representative in Pemba, and that therefore the Government could not get a complete report, the Society sent out Mr. MACKENZIE, a man experienced in African affairs, familiar with Arabic and with the natives. His report had supplied the Government with an immense mass of information not previously in their possession. Those who had called the meeting had no desire whatever to do anything in opposition to the Government, but rather to strengthen their hands, and to make it clear by such a meeting as that held at the Mansion House, in the very heart of the Empire, that the whole nation would no longer tolerate the disgrace of Slavery under the British flag. (Cheers.) It was humiliating to think that five years after the proclamation of a British protectorate in Zanzibar and Pemba Slavery should still be carried on as actively as ever before. For this there was but one remedy, and that was the total abolition of the status of Slavery in the Protectorate, for which purpose a resolution would be submitted to them. They were anxious that the SULTAN OF ZANZIBAR, the representatives of the Government abroad, and the English and Europeans living in the districts in question should realise that it was not a feeble Society in London that had taken this matter in hand, but that it was a subject upon which the mind of the whole of England was made up—that they would no longer bear the disgrace of allowing Slavery to exist in a country which was absolutely under English control. (Hear, hear, and cheers.) He then moved the adoption of the Annual Report of the Society, and the re-election of the Committee and officers. This having been agreed to, he read a letter which had been received from **Mr. T. BAYLEY, M.P.**, as follows:—

DOLGELLY, *Oct. 11, 1895.*

DEAR SIR,—I thank you for the invitation you have given me to speak at your meeting on the 14th inst., and much regret that I shall not be there.

I am very pleased at the energetic way in which your Society is taking up the question of Slavery under the British flag in Zanzibar. If we could get the people of England to understand the facts of the case, as laid down in the Report of Mr. HARDINGE, and presented to Parliament in a Blue Book

of April, 1895, and also in Mr. DONALD MACKENZIE's very able Report to your Society—the frightful and unheard-of state of things now going on would be immediately stopped by our good honest common-sense and love of fair play.

The facts, as officially stated, are as follows :—

- (1.) That Her Majesty's servants are administering the law in Zanzibar, which acknowledges the legal status of Slavery. This, from questions I have asked in the House, is, I believe, illegal for any British subject to do, and still more so for one of Her Majesty's servants.

Could not the Society take proceedings in a case like this, so as to have the question legally settled? I think, if I remember the Act correctly, a summons would have to be taken out at Bow Street.

- (2.) Sir LLOYD MATHEWS estimates that 62,000 Slaves are held legally, and 78,000 illegally.

And yet, after reading Mr. HARDINGE's Report, not one word do I see therein with any suggestion of how he proposes to give freedom to those 78,000 Slaves, whom their masters now hold illegally (even by Zanzibar law) under the British flag.

- (3.) Mr. HARDINGE gives the following most disgraceful reason, in his Report to LORD KIMBERLEY, dated March 13, 1895, for the continuance of the existing state of Slavery in Zanzibar. I will give his own words :—"A more serious effect of the rise in price of labour, and difficulty of obtaining it, will be that landing charges will be doubled, which will practically amount to a 4 or 5 per cent. duty on all goods landed at Zanzibar, and will very considerably impair the benefit derived by trade from the establishment of the free port. All lighterage, loading, and coaling operations will suffer."

Yes, because this trade is entirely in the hands of British merchants! He has put this reason in his Report as being purely a British financial one. Further comment is unnecessary.

The plague-spot of the African Slave-trade is now in our own hands. And when we have the Official Report estimating the Slaves held—legally and illegally—in Zanzibar at 140,000, and then we are told that for every Slave held ten lives have been lost to get him as a working animal under our flag, we know, as a fact, that something like one million four hundred thousand lives of innocent men, women and children have been sacrificed in this barbarous trade.

It is quite time that a strong Christian nation should take on itself its responsibilities and duties to these people, and stop once and for ever this curse of Africa. We have the power to do it, and it only requires at the present time that the British nation should be roused to a sense of its responsibility.

I must congratulate Mr. DONALD MACKENZIE on his very able and, as I think, fair Report to your Society, and I sincerely hope your Society will start a campaign this winter to rouse us all up, so that when Parliament meets, in February, the pressure of public opinion will be so great that the Government will take the bold and fearless step of washing its hands for ever of negro Slavery in Her Majesty's dominions.—Yours faithfully,

THOMAS BAYLEY.

The Secretary, ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

MR. DONALD MACKENZIE'S ADDRESS.

MR. CHAIRMAN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN,—Within recent years, the special attention of England has been directed towards Africa, and nearly the whole of that great Continent has been mapped out, with or without the consent of the natives, as Protectorates and Spheres of Influence of the various European Powers, one of the *main* reasons for this forward movement being the demand made by public opinion that a check should be put on Slavery, and especially on the Slave-trade, which still devastates large tracts of that Continent. It was during these negotiations that England assumed the Protectorate of Zanzibar, Pemba, and an enormous tract of East Central Africa, for which she surrendered to Germany the important possession of Heligoland, and to France her treaty rights with respect to Madagascar. Previous to the period when England declared these vast regions to be Protectorates of the British Crown, she had taken an active part in endeavouring to check the Slave-trade in those countries. An Anti-Slavery meeting, held in this very hall, more than twenty years ago, was one of the main factors in the movement which culminated in the conclusion by the British Government of a Treaty with SAID BURGHASH, Sultan of Zanzibar, for the abolition of the Slave-trade by sea throughout his dominions.

This Treaty, which was concluded in 1873, between Great Britain and Zanzibar, through the instrumentality of the late Sir BARTLE FRÈRE and Sir JOHN KIRK, rendered illegal the importation of Slaves into the islands. As, however, the number of Slaves in Zanzibar and Pemba has in no way diminished, and large numbers of those imported before the conclusion of the Treaty have died, it follows that a steady and considerable Slave-trade must have been maintained in order to keep up the great diminution in numbers caused by death. Consequently, the greater part of the present Slave population of Zanzibar and Pemba is now illegally held in bondage, even according to Mohammedan law. Indeed, Consul SMITH, who was formerly resident in Zanzibar, estimates the number of Slaves as now legally held in bondage as only five to ten per cent. of the whole number, as stated in the last Blue Book, "Africa," No. 6, 1895.

The authorities were not long in perceiving that the Treaty of 1873, and a later one of 1876, affecting the mainland, were absolutely a dead letter, for, in March, 1884, we have Sir JOHN KIRK representing to the Home Government that he believed the non-recognition of Slavery as a status known to the law to be essential to prosperity in Pemba, and I have reason to know that Sir JOHN holds the same opinion still.

Although the late EARL GRANVILLE added the weight of his influence to that of Her Majesty's Representative in Zanzibar, the status of Slavery was not abolished, and as a matter of fact, it continues up to the present day, although for more than four years the Sultanate of Zanzibar has become a British Protectorate, and the administration of the country is carried on exclusively by British subjects, all of whom, I believe, with one or two exceptions, are actually natives of the British Islands.

The Decree issued in 1890, at the instigation of the British Government, which confirmed all former Decrees, was so utterly worthless that it scarcely deserves mention.

The BRITISH AND FOREIGN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY had, from time to time, issued strong protests against the flagrant neglect to carry out Treaties which had been obtained at the cost of so much trouble and expense, and when, in 1890, the Sultanate became a British Protectorate, it redoubled its

efforts to procure the abolition of the Status of Slavery in territories which were actually under British control. In order that the public might receive full information upon a question so gravely affecting the national honour, the SOCIETY did me the honour to ask me to undertake a special mission on its behalf to investigate the condition of the Slave population in the British Protectorate of Zanzibar, and to endeavour, if possible, to inspect the clove plantations of the Island of Pemba, which had rarely, if ever before, been visited by an Englishman.

Meanwhile, the Government appeared to be somewhat alive to the gravity of the situation, for in the debate which took place in the House of Commons last March, on the supplementary vote for the suppression of the Slave-trade, we find the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs in speaking of the abolition of the Status of Slavery in Zanzibar, saying frankly "the thing had to be done"—(cheers)—"and the Government had asked for a report from those best able to judge as to the best means of doing it."

A Report had been presented to the Government by the officials in Zanzibar, which you have had the opportunity of studying, and I would ask you, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, to allow me now to add my small quota to the reports already published, and to give you in as few words as possible, my reasons for believing that the British Government cannot much longer delay abolishing the Status of Slavery in its Protectorates in East Africa, as in former years it has so successfully done in India, on the West Coast of Africa, and elsewhere. The privilege of having been chosen as your Commissioner I esteem as one of the greatest of my life.

I arrived in Zanzibar in the beginning of March last, and, having had the opportunity, crossed over to the German Protectorate of Dar Es Salaam. I have seen, and heard on good authority, such a report of German rule in that part of Africa that I cannot help wishing, for the sake of German reputation, and the well-being of the poor Africans, that His Imperial Majesty the EMPEROR OF GERMANY would make one of his surprise visits to that part of his dominions. On my return to Zanzibar I had an interview with Mr. HARDINGE, Her Majesty's Agent and Consul-General, to whom I frankly imparted the object of my mission. I am pleased to state that he entered fully into the question, and having informed him that I intended to proceed to Pemba, an island hardly ever visited by Europeans, he kindly proposed that I should go to that place in one of the SULTAN's steamers. I am also pleased to state that General Sir LLOYD MATHEWS, the Prime Minister of the Zanzibar Government, offered me every assistance in carrying out my inquiry, and gave me the services of a black servant from the staff of the Civil Service to accompany me to Pemba. This island has a very bad reputation as to climate, and from the known hostility of the Arab Slave-traders, for you may remember that the late unfortunate Captain BROWNRIFF, who was cruising about that island looking after Slave dhows, came to a most tragic end, some years ago, he having been murdered by Arabs who were illegally engaged in the Slave-trade.

On this occasion Sir LLOYD MATHEWS proceeded to the island, and declared to the Arabs that he would burn all their towns and villages unless the culprits were brought forth. The murderers were soon found, and executed on the spot. In this adventure General MATHEWS nearly lost his life, but it was a salutary lesson to the Arabs of the island.

I started for Pemba on the 13th March last, with letters of introduction from the SULTAN to his Governors or Walis; from Mr. HARDINGE, Her Majesty's Agent and Consul-General, and also from Messrs.

CHARLESWORTH & CO. Although I received every attention from the SULTAN, I had reason to believe that he had sent emissaries before me to Pemba, to prepare the Arabs for my visit, so that I probably saw things at their best. The Arabs were evidently rather uneasy at my visit, but I was enabled, through the introductions given me, to pass through the centre of the island, and visit places to which few (if any) Englishmen had ever penetrated. I saw the Slaves working on the clove and rice plantations everywhere, Pemba and Zanzibar being the two principal clove-producing districts of the world.

There are probably nearly about 90,000 Slaves in the island of Pemba, and they are entirely at the mercy of their masters, who can punish them in whatever manner they please, even unto death, without any check whatever from the authorities. I found the climate quite as good as that of Zanzibar, and I was told that the Arabs had published reports of the insalubrity of the island in order that Europeans should not visit them, so that they could carry on the Slave-trade without any fear of molestation for the supply of their plantations. The communication between Zanzibar and Pemba is by dhow, and Slaves are passed on from the former to the latter by means of permits granted by the Zanzibar Government. Any dhow having Slaves on board possessing these permits cannot be touched by Her Majesty's ships. Public opinion in this country has lately led the Government to appoint a Vice-Consul for Pemba, and I was pleased to be in that island to receive him, he being the first British official ever appointed to reside there. The Arabs were not favourable to the appointment, and a deputation waited on the WALI of Chaki-Chaki to protest against the step, but the Arab Governor was wise in his generation, and told his fellow Slave-holders that it was a serious thing to oppose England's wishes, they must meekly submit to the will of God. The Vice-Consul was therefore received with apparent goodwill, and he can do much for humanity if his heart is in his work.

This conduct of the Arab Governor augurs well for the reception that would be given to a decree abolishing the status of Slavery.

It would be impossible, in the limits of this address, to give you many particulars of my personal adventures in the hitherto almost unvisited Island of Pemba, suffice it to say that my interviews with many of the chief Arab planters were not devoid of interest, and in some cases they even bore a touch of the ludicrous; for instance, my persisting in riding through Pemba upon one of the native donkeys excited a kind of sullen opposition, which it was difficult to overcome. However, at length a cavalcade was formed and I was able to accomplish my ride through the beautiful valleys with which the island abounds, and to contemplate at my leisure the extensive clove plantations, the graceful cocoanut trees, and other tropical vegetation.

My excursion finished somewhat abruptly in floods of rain and several disagreeable falls into the slippery mud which took the place of sand.

Throughout this journey Slaves were to be seen at work everywhere.

In Zanzibar a good many people had been telling me how happy and contented the Slaves were in the hands of the Arabs; in fact, they would not desire their freedom. At Chaki Chaki I walked into a tumble-down old prison. Here I found a number of prisoners, male and female, heavily chained and fettered. I thought surely these men and women must be dreadful criminals, or murderers, or they must have committed similar crimes and are now awaiting their doom. I inquired of them all why they were there. The only real criminal was one who had stolen a little rice from his master. All the others I found were wearing those ponderous chains and

fetters because they had attempted to run away from their cruel masters and gain their freedom—a very eloquent commentary on the happiness of the Slaves!

During my stay in Zanzibar I gathered as much information as possible regarding the Slave-trade and Slavery, and came into contact during the inquiry with Mr. HARDINGE (the British Agent and Consul-General), Sir LLOYD MATHEWS (the Prime Minister of the Zanzibar Government), Judge CRACKNALL, Archdeacon JONES-BATEMAN, and several merchants and officials of Zanzibar and East Africa. I also gathered all possible information from native and other sources. I left Zanzibar on the 12th of April for Aden, staying at Mombasa and Lamu on the way, where I gleaned much valuable information on the Slave question. (Cheers.) Before returning to England I visited Hodeidah, one of the principal ports of Arabia, and afterwards Zailah, which is a most important possession belonging to England in Somaliland. I also stayed at Assab and Massowah, in the Italian Protectorates, making careful inquiries regarding the Slave-trade carried on in the Red Sea; but as the whole of this inquiry will shortly be issued in a special report by the ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY, on which separate action will be taken, seeing that the Slave-trade is carried on in direct contravention of Treaties with Turkey, etc., I shall not trouble you with details here to-day. The purpose of this Meeting, so far as I understand it, is to draw special attention to Slavery and the Slave-trade as carried on in the British Protectorates of Zanzibar, Pemba, and East Africa, and it is with this important subject I propose to deal. Having laid before you a brief sketch of my journey, I shall now endeavour to explain to you the whole system of Slavery and the Slave-trade as it exists to-day in the British Protectorates of Zanzibar and East Africa.

You are aware that Slavery is an old Mohammedan institution, and that the Arabs have been Slave dealers from time immemorial. They drew, and still draw, their supplies of Slaves from the interior of Africa, desolation and death always following in their wake.

Within the last few years England has become responsible for the state of affairs in Zanzibar, Pemba, and East Africa, yet no improvement has been made in the condition of the Slaves, or any attempt to remove the evil of Slavery itself. It is true that some of Her Majesty's warships have captured a few Slave dhows, and have lately shown some activity in this direction, but all authorities have agreed in the opinion that not more than some five or six per cent. are ever captured.

We will now consider the population of Zanzibar and Pemba, and, for the purpose of this report, in the absence of census or any other data to assist us, we shall accept the late SAID BURGHASH's estimate as being, in my judgment, a fair calculation of the population of the two islands. SAID BURGHASH estimated the number of inhabitants at 400,000 souls, 266,000 of whom were Slaves. The Europeans and Goanese number some 200, and the British-Indians 8,500. The balance is composed of Arabs, aborigines, and freed Slaves, the number of whom is uncertain.

The Arabs, who number, probably, 10,000, have always been the lords of the soil; the British Indians are the financiers and merchants; the Europeans, merchants; the Goanese, shopkeepers and servants.

In order that the present state of Slavery may be clearly understood, we shall divide the Slaves into three classes:—

Domestic Slaves: principally composed of male and female harem and household Slaves, and eunuchs.

Plantation Slaves : these work in the *shambas*, Thursday and Friday in each week being usually allowed them to cultivate *m'hogo* or cassava, a root which forms their staple food. They build their own huts, and the masters provide them with loin-cloths, or such scanty clothing as is absolutely necessary.

Labourers in port towns : this class of Slaves work under entirely different conditions to the other two, and they have three distinct occupations, (1) those who work in the harbour as labourers in loading or discharging vessels, and general warehouse and town labour ; *women are largely engaged in this work, especially in coaling ships, including our men-of-war, in house-building, or repairing* ; (2) the second class are porters who carry goods or stores into the interior of Africa.

European travelling into the interior of Africa has undergone a complete change since the days of Dr. LIVINGSTONE, whose expeditions were peaceful ones, and left behind them pleasant recollections. Now, armed expeditions are pouring into the interior, under the command of Europeans, who, in many cases, kill, plunder and burn the villages of the natives, almost rivalling in horror and destruction the Arab raids in quest of Slaves.

These scandals having come to the ears of the Zanzibar Government, rules were drawn up in order to control in some way the leaders of the caravans, or the Europeans who hire the Slaves as porters, but they only mitigate the evil very slightly, the rules not being sufficiently stringent. I drew the attention of Mr. HARDINGE and Sir LLOYD MATHEWS to them, and they promised that the rules should be improved, particularly as regards the circumstances under which men were lost on the journeys.

The third class of Slaves are domestic servants to Europeans, Indians and Goanese, who, not being allowed to hold Slaves direct, have to hire them from their owners.

The various occupations of all these different kinds of Slaves are classed under the name of "free labour"—quite a misleading name, made to suit European ears—the only difference being that all British subjects deal with the Slaves direct, and not with the master, or they may hire from a contractor, who need not necessarily be a Slave-holder, but who knows where to get them. Payment is made to the Slaves direct, who, in turn, hand to their masters half of their earnings, with the other half they have to buy their own food and clothes : in the case of porters, the hirer has to provide them with food.

The pay of porters and harbour labourers is, usually, 10 rupees per month ; women labourers receive less.

The regulation load of porters is 70 lbs. each ; but beyond that they have to carry food, water, and cooking utensils, which may bring the load up to 100 lbs., or more. They have to march about 12 miles a day.

These Slave porters are the only means of transport for our Government, for missionaries and merchants between the interior of Africa and the coast. If any of them are taken ill, they are often left by the path-side to die, their loads are distributed among the others, and the caravan proceeds on its march, without any further notice being taken of those who drop by the way. The mortality amongst them was given to me on the very highest authority at 30 per cent.—a terrible loss of human life. One traveller went into the interior, a few years ago, with 450 men, and he came back with only 190. This is only an instance of what happens in the "Dark" Continent. The portage of one ton of goods from Mombasa to Uganda costs upwards of £200—rather a heavy price for such a distance.

Domestic servants are generally men, and they receive about 7 rupees per month; the women are water carriers, and are paid 5 rupees per month. They all receive their wages direct from their employers, but each hands to the master one-half. A Slave is told by his master to seek employment, and, if he cannot find it, he is punished. Slaves have to work fairly hard in whatever situation they find, and it makes it still worse when the half of their hardly-earned wages goes to the lazy and cruel Arab. The masters have hardly any responsibility as regards the Slaves, and only provide them with food when they are out of employment, and as the masters are usually the owners of *shambas*, this hardly costs anything. The masters usually make about 50 per cent. clear profit on the original price of the Slave.

It is a curious fact that Slaves have but very few children, hence the necessity for the continued importation of raw Slaves to supply the demand. I was much struck with the evidence of non-increase amongst the Slaves as regards children. Taking the death-rate at 30 per mille, upwards of 7,000 Slaves would have to be imported annually to supply this deficiency in labour.

I am told that the mode of transit from the mainland to Zanzibar has been changed, owing to the fact that dhows attracted too much attention, and canoes are now employed to convey the Slaves. There are upwards of 2,000 sailing canoes in Zanzibar, and I should think that there were quite as many in Pemba. I am of opinion that at least 6,000 Slaves are imported yearly into Zanzibar and Pemba from the mainland of Africa, for labour on those islands. The traffic in Slaves between the two islands has been modified to some extent. Every Arab who owns estates in Pemba and Zanzibar (and they nearly all do), has the right to send Slaves to work in his *shambas* on any of the islands, the Zanzibar Government giving him a permit for this purpose.

In this way the Arabs are able to carry on a Slave-trade between the two islands, under a pretence that the Slaves are required for their *shambas*, but many are shipped to the Persian Gulf, as I have shown above.

None of the Slaves possess any civil rights, except that they can complain against their masters to the Consul-General in cases of gross cruelty, and demand their freedom; but it is seldom that they avail themselves of this right. In the first place, very few know of the Consul-General, and, under existing circumstances, freedom would be a curse to them, as they would be outcasts, and their masters would have many ways of getting rid of them by poison or otherwise. The majority would therefore prefer to stand the cruelty, rather than to come into conflict with their masters. Many of the Slaves who have been set free by the Consul-General have afterwards been kidnapped, and no trace of them has been found.

The export of Slaves to the Arabian Coast from the mainland of East Africa is probably some 11,000 per annum, Pemba and Zanzibar adding their quota, each dhow taking on an average seven Slaves, though some may risk taking a larger number. According to the Report of the Select Committee on the East African Slave Trade, presented to Parliament in 1871, the export from the mainland into Zanzibar and the Arabian coast amounted to upwards of 20,000 Slaves per annum. My estimate, therefore, is probably much lower than the real number exported from the African coast.

There are about 1,500 dhows going and coming to Zanzibar, Pemba, and East Africa under various flags.

The dhows make two voyages a year, one to Zanzibar and East Africa, and the other back to Arabia in the south-west monsoon.

The above are only very approximate estimates of the number of Slaves exported, although the calculation is the result of very careful inquiry, and I am anxious not to overstate the case.

In nearly all the dhows which have been captured going north in these parts from time to time, small boys were found, mutilated for the harems in Arabia, and the mortality is well known to be very great.

In Zanzibar I noticed one thing to which public attention should be drawn: women prisoners may be seen every day chained together in gangs of about seven, carrying water or doing some other work, followed by a policeman with a stick. It seems to me that a public exhibition of this kind is very demoralising to the people generally, and I think it should be removed.

The whole system of Slavery in Zanzibar and Pemba is a very complicated question, and to deal with it all its ramifications must be closely examined. The householder seeks the cheapest domestic servants he can find; the merchants look upon the labour question as a serious one, and rightly so, for they know that under present conditions they can command Slave labour at 10 rupees a month, but if Slavery were abolished, they think that the whole labour market would be disturbed, and their business would suffer in consequence; then, in case of the abolition of Slavery, they seek Indian coolie labour. The owners of *shambas* are afraid that their Slaves would run away, and thus their properties would be rendered worthless. The Zanzibar Government is naturally timid, because, if the aforesaid evils were likely to come to pass, the country might soon be in bankruptcy. The bulk of the Zanzibar revenue being derived from the cultivation of cloves, if the Slaves were to cease work or run away there would be no more cloves, and a revenue of upwards of £30,000 a year would be gone.

The British Agent and Consul-General has this dire picture brought vividly before him whenever he makes a suggestion for the purpose of removing, in some way, the evils of Slavery.

Some of the Government officials enlarge on the virtue of Slavery—in fact, according to their views, the Slaves are so happy that they would not accept their freedom if it were offered to them; they say, further, that the African has always been a Slave, and that he is not fitted for anything else; in fact, that he is in love with the lash, the chain, and the fetter. Others are for emancipation outright, and believe there would be no danger in carrying it out, whilst benefit to the islands would accrue. I repeat that these arguments were used to me on several occasions; no one approved of Slavery in principle, but, under existing circumstances, it was considered a blessing to the Africans. I always thought—and do still think—it the greatest curse that ever befell Africa.

The SULTAN is opposed to the abolition of Slavery, because he is the largest Slave-holder in Zanzibar, and is said to possess 30,000 Slaves; if these were set free he would no longer receive an income from them.

Behind all these advocates for upholding Slavery stand the British-Indian financiers, who support these ideas with all their might, as they are deeply interested. The Indians are, indirectly, the real Slave-holders of Zanzibar and Pemba. All the Arab *shambas*, or estates, are mortgaged to them up to the hilt, and, naturally, the abolition of Slavery would remove one of the chief assets, or securities, for their mortgages. They have also financed, and, I suppose, still finance Slave caravans; indeed, it was a well-known Indian

who first financed TIPPOO TIB. (I met this arch-Slave dealer in Zanzibar lately.) Some of the Indians were accused of direct Slave dealing. They foreclose mortgages on houses in towns, but not on the *shambas*, as the English law will not allow British subjects to hold Slaves to work the estates. On this account they allow the Arabs to keep in possession, and content themselves with receiving their interest. They much fear that if Slavery were to be abolished their money would be lost, as, they say, the Slaves would run away and the *shambas* would be worthless.

I have been able to ascertain how far the British Indians are financially interested in upholding the present state of affairs. There are no less than 3,955 *shambas*, or estates, mortgaged to them for a total sum of about £220,000.

The arguments given above arise from highly interested motives, and all those whose interests may be affected are banded together to thwart any measure which Her Majesty's Government may propose. There were, no doubt, similar opponents to every measure of freedom that has been proposed for the benefit of the human family. Did serfs run away when they were set free? or did Slaves in British possessions run away when they gained their freedom? If all the Slaves of Zanzibar and Pemba were freed to-morrow I do not think for a moment that it would disturb the prosperity of these islands. The freed Slaves could not live on their freedom, they would have to work for their living; the necessity for labour on *shambas* and in port towns would not cease with the abolition of Slavery; the Arab would require labour for his *shamba*; the merchant would require men for loading and discharging cargo, and for his warehouse; the householder would still want servants. If the Slaves were free they would receive their pay in full, work more willingly and better for their employers, and, the blacks being vain and fond of dress, their freedom would, in my opinion, improve the trade in manufactured goods.

The present Arab free labour from the Hadramout is an evidence that if the monopoly now enjoyed by large contractors were removed there would be a larger influx of these people for the purposes of labour. These men, who are perfectly free, load and discharge all vessels in Aden, receiving about 10d. a day.

From my own personal observation these men work exceedingly well, and their labour is far superior to that of the Slaves of Zanzibar.

As far as the Arabs in Zanzibar and Pemba are concerned, they might arrange to pay the freed Slaves half the product for their labour instead of money. This is a custom in many parts of the world, and is well known to the Arabs, who probably introduced it into Spain, where it still exists. This idea apparently favourably impressed Sir LLOYD MATHEWS when I suggested it to him.

I do not see that the abolition of Slavery would injure the revenue of the Zanzibar Government. I think a great advantage would result from it in every way, and some of the Zanzibar officials and merchants hold these views.

I do not deny that some of the Arabs treat their slaves fairly well, and, perhaps, kindly, their condition naturally depending upon the disposition of the master; but we have to look beyond that. The principle is opposed to all that Europeans hold dear—personal liberty, and the view that no human being of any colour should be made an article of barter or exchange.

Then we have to consider that, according to the lowest estimate, the sacrifice of human lives in Central Africa which has to be made to place

266,000 Slaves in Zanzibar and Pemba reaches the appalling amount of over one million souls. Every year 24,000 lives have to be sacrificed in order to supply the local demand in Zanzibar and Pemba. Over 40,000 lives are sacrificed yearly to supply the export of Slaves to the Arabian coast. This is why a Slave who cost, in the interior, a few yards of calico, is worth from £10 to £20 by the time he reaches the coast, so many dying in capture and on the road.

In looking at the whole question calmly, I am convinced that the legal status of Slavery should be abolished at the earliest possible moment. I did think that compensation might form part of the scheme, but when we consider that all treaties and decrees have been thrown aside as waste paper, and that Slavery has been going on for upwards of 20 years in violation of solemn engagements entered into with this country, I think that the question of compensation should be dismissed; in fact, I very much doubt if any Slaves imported prior to 1873 are in existence. But any measure which the Government may propose for the abolition of Slavery in Zanzibar and Pemba will share the same fate as former treaties and decrees, unless the carrying out of such measure is entrusted to a special staff of English officers appointed for the purpose.

There are advocates in East Africa for gradual abolition, but this was tried and found wanting. The whole scheme in my opinion is absurd and impracticable. There are only two practical courses open to us: either to acknowledge Slavery as an institution, with all its train of horrors and miseries, or to abolish the whole system at one blow. It seems to me that if you accept anything less than the abolition of the status of Slavery in Zanzibar, Pemba, and East Africa, and that at once, that Slavery will continue as it is now for an indefinite period. They tell us that the abolition of Slavery might lead to a revolution among the Arabs. I do not believe it for a moment. They know that they have been trading and keeping Slaves for upwards of twenty years in direct violation of solemn engagements between this country and the SULTAN. They are, I believe, expecting the change to come. Did they rise in civil war when England placed the present SULTAN on the throne of Zanzibar against the will of the Arabs? No; and he is now as secure as if he had been the rightful heir.

It is stated that the construction of the railway to Uganda will almost lead to the entire extinction of Slavery, especially Slave-raiding. I grant that it may check Slave-raiding to some extent, and possibly do away with Slave porters as far as the journey between Uganda and the coast is concerned, but porters will be required to bring produce from other districts to the railway. I am convinced that while the demand continues no effective check can be placed on the supply. To stop Slave-raiding, it is necessary, in my opinion, to abolish Slavery itself, and not recognise it in any shape or form. The abolition of Slavery is not a difficult measure for the Government to carry out, for it cannot be defended even by the Mohammedans themselves, except on sordid grounds. Should such reasons be sufficient for the British Government to hold back from giving freedom to those poor innocent Slaves who are at the present moment entirely at the mercy of their Arab owners? The manner in which former Treaties and Decrees have been ignored or evaded by the Arabs is an insult to the majesty of England, and I believe that the Anti-Slavery feeling in this country will not much longer tolerate, within the British Dominions, the continuance of the greatest crime that has ever been perpetrated on the human family. I hope that the

Government will, without further delay, remove this disgrace to our glorious flag, which has always been for ages the sign of liberty, freedom, and justice. (Cheers.)

Mr. JOSEPH A. PEASE, M.P., said, The Resolution which I am asked to move is as follows :—

“That this Meeting, whilst desiring to record its sense of the wisdom and consistency which led the Government, in time past, to abolish the status of Slavery in India, on the Gold Coast of Africa, in Cyprus, and elsewhere, whereby freedom was ensured to all natives of those countries under British protection, would hereby express its deep regret that the break in the continuity of the national moral policy should still be allowed to exist with regard to the Slaves now held in bondage in the British Protectorate of Zanzibar.”

In moving the Resolution which has been placed in my hand, there will be no need to dwell upon our national Anti-Slavery record. We may, however, briefly recall certain land-marks in the movement. In 1772 LORD MANSFIELD laid down the law that directly a Slave set his foot on the British Islands he became free. 1807, an Act was passed prohibiting the introduction of Slaves into the British Colonies, and in 1833, the great Act of Emancipation was passed liberating all Slaves in the British Colonial Possessions. The example which Englishmen thus set was quickly followed by other nations, and from that time to within recent years it has been Britain's boast that her Government ever used its power to discountenance and destroy Slavery and the Slave-trade wherever British influence was felt.

In India in 1843, on the Gold Coast in 1874, and in Cyprus in 1879, the Government of the day abolished the status of Slavery, and it is a point of deepest regret that there has been a break recently in the continuity of our Anti-Slavery policy, and that the necessity has arisen for holding a Meeting to protest against the want of action, or for urging forward the Government on this question. Standing here now in the capital of the Empire, in this hall associated with so many historical events, I am acutely sensible of the national disgrace which has made it necessary for us to meet here to urge our Government to take steps to free those who are now held in bondage, most of them admittedly illegally held, in two islands under effective British control. It is a humiliating position! (Loud cheers.) What are the facts? Sir LLOYD MATHEWS, the SULTAN'S Prime Minister, estimates the number of Slaves at 140,000; Mr. DONALD MACKENZIE quotes SAID BURGHASH'S estimate of 266,000; whilst Sir LLOYD MATHEWS estimates the importation at from 1,000 to 1,500 a year, Mr. MACKENZIE computes the number at some 6,000, but the acknowledged high death-rate and increased production of cloves, which are picked in increased quantities every year, indicate that Mr. MACKENZIE'S estimate is considerably within the mark. (Cheers.) In his speech in the recent debate in the House of

COMMONS Mr. STANLEY advocated the suspension of abolition in Zanzibar and Pemba until Slave-raiding had been put down. In urging this, I think he places the cart before the horse, for Slavery means the creation of a demand for Slaves, and as it has been illegal since 1873, and the prices have been raised, there are increased inducements to the Arabs to secure new Slaves by clandestine traffic.

It is estimated that there are 500,000 to 2,000,000 Slaves every year raided, and that nine out of ten of these die under circumstances too revolting to picture—and deeds so inhuman, so cruel, that words would fail to describe. That caravan routes can be followed by the dry human bones, which are all that is left to tell of the murder of thousands of our fellow men by cruel Arabs, ought to be sufficient to rouse us to clean our hands of our share in this abominable system. (Loud cheers.)

What have our Governments been doing?

Is the spirit of our forefathers dead that roused Governments to action in the past? (Cheers.) That spirit which secured emancipation in 1833? That blazed abroad at the time of the Bulgarian atrocities, and which has been manifested recently in connection with Armenia? No! (Loud cheers.) The BRITISH AND FOREIGN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY has ample evidence that the country is with them in their crusade against the whole system, and that the nation is ready to rise to support the Government, or if need be, to compel them to pursue an Anti-Slavery policy. (Loud cheers.)

The policy pursued with respect to Zanzibar has been one of drift. Our Foreign Ministers have apparently been satisfied with the passing of Decrees, with the hope that a gradual reduction in numbers would ultimately terminate the system. Attempts have been made to restrict the supply of Slaves, but it was not until last November that definite action with a view to terminate effectively the status of Slavery in the Islands was taken, prompted mainly by the pressure of the ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY. Lord KIMBERLEY then asked our Consul-General "Whether some fresh steps cannot be taken towards its speedy extinction?"

In February came back the reply that Mr. HARDINGE, influenced by Sir LLOYD MATHEWS' view, does not "feel able to recommend the immediate abolition of the legal status of Slavery," though he admits that it could be done without danger of disturbance. Since then no definite steps have been actually taken as far as we know by the late or present Government to secure the speedy extinction of Slavery.

Who is Sir LLOYD MATHEWS? He is the SULTAN's own Prime Minister. The SULTAN himself is the owner of 30,000 Slaves, and whilst I do not desire to reflect upon the motives of Sir LLOYD, yet I do say it is a monstrous thing that our Government should be prevented from terminating Slavery, owing to the view of a man, no matter how eminent, who from the position he occupies, and his long association with the custom, is opposed to definite action being taken.

After the expression of view in the Debate I raised in the House last March, it was obvious any Government would be generously supported which took action, and I cannot understand any reason for the delay that has occurred—a delay which has fully justified the holding of this Meeting, and not before time. (Cheers.)

If we set an example in those areas over which we have control in the East of Africa, that example will be followed by other nations, and concerted action may then bring pressure to bear upon those Mohammedan races whose laws tolerate Slavery, though the Koran itself encourages manumission.

Slavery to-day is illegal throughout the dominions of the Ottoman Porte, but the complicity and laxity of officials is notorious; and as in Bulgaria formerly, and as in Armenia to-day, cruelty and oppression can only be averted by the interference of Christian Powers. In appealing to you to support this resolution, I do it not only because Slavery means the destruction of the rights of man and all virtue in woman: and not only because base cruelty and cowardly devilry is associated with the whole system: but on grounds of true morality I urge the continuity of British Anti-Slavery policy. Slavery mars all sense of human dignity, which lies at the foundation of morals: it destroys all family relationship, tears children from their mothers, takes husbands from their wives, and is disastrous to morality in master and slave alike.

But I would appeal to you on still higher grounds: on those of our common Christian religion, which teaches us to love one another, and which has never recognised, nor ever can recognise, the right of one man to possess property in the person of his fellow. (Loud and prolonged cheers.)

Mr. BOSWORTH SMITH, in seconding the Resolution, observed that it was a happy circumstance that they were met not to urge upon an unwilling Government a duty which they had been inclined to shirk, or which they would be likely to be half-hearted in dealing with when the time for action came, but, on the contrary, to give them such encouragement and support as outsiders could in dealing with a difficulty, a danger, and a disgrace. (Hear, hear.) A Government, one of whose first public acts was to declare that they would at once begin that railway to Uganda which ought to have been begun by others three years ago, moved by the inspiring motive that they would thus be able to strike a blow at the Slave-trade near its heart, 600 miles from the coast, was not likely to hesitate to strike a blow at the Slavery which created the demand for the Slave trade when both were found to exist almost beneath its very eyes. **Mr. MACKENZIE's** report showed that much more than half of the inhabitants of the islands of Zanzibar and Pemba, which passed under our protectorate five years ago, were to this day Slaves, and of those Slaves the vast majority were not domestic Slaves—not Slaves born in the house, or even on the estates of their owners; they were not Slaves in the sense in which there had been Slaves in all primitive communities, but they were Slaves exported from the far interior, torn against

their will from their homes and families, smuggled over in some of those 1,500 Slave dhows which were still to be found plying their accursed trade on British coasts and around British islands. The partition of Africa, in which Great Britain had borne a leading part, had enormously increased the responsibility of Great Britain as regarded Slavery, and was only to be justified if it were turned to the lasting good of the natives. (Hear, hear.) It was the glory of Christendom, and of England above all—nay, more than all Christian nations put together, to have done most in these latter days to put down Slavery and the Slave-trade. The twenty millions which, early in this century, we paid down to get rid of Slavery in our colonies, and the squadrons which we had maintained since then on the West and East Coasts of Africa to put down, as far as might be, the oceanic Slave-trade, were among the chapters in our history—perhaps the chapter in our history—of which we might be most proud. And the “continuity of our moral policy”—if he might use a phrase for which he was himself originally responsible—demanded that what we had done before we should continue now and continue to the end. (Hear, hear.) It was said that the islands would be ruined by Slave emancipation, for Africans would not work in such a climate without compulsion, and so the rich clove and cocoanut plantations would cease to exist. It was true that the African would not work hard. It was not in his nature to do so; but exactly the same difficulty existed in the West India Islands on emancipation; and the results, if they were not all that could be desired, were not altogether to be despised. And, even if the worst came to the worst—if the freed Slaves would not work at all, and if free labourers could not be introduced from elsewhere—and the land went out of cultivation, England could do better with the loss of her cloves and her cocoanuts than she could with the loss of her national honour, her traditional philanthropy, her immemorial and her passionate love of freedom. (Hear, hear, and cheers.) He had no belief in a philanthropy which began with injustice. He would not refuse compensation to a single English publican who was deprived of his publichouse for the public good; nor would he refuse compensation to a single Slave-holder who had to give up his property in Slaves in deference to our views of morality and religion. (Oh!) He knew it would be said that the great majority of Slaves in Zanzibar and Pemba were not legally Slaves, because the SULTAN OF ZANZIBAR, the chief Slave-owner, had, under pressure from us, repeatedly declared the traffic in Slaves and the *status* of Slavery to be at an end. The benevolent proclamations of the SULTAN OF ZANZIBAR, like the benevolent proclamations of a greater Sultan nearer England, were, however, never meant to be carried out, and never could be carried out, either in Zanzibar or in Armenia, without the continued pressure and supervision of some European Power. We had hitherto refrained from putting that pressure and exercising that supervision. We were responsible, therefore, for any rights of property which had accrued among the Arabs from our culpable neglect.

Anyhow, the hour had come and the man. The Prime Minister who had shown that he was not to be trifled with in Armenia or in China, would not allow himself to be trifled with in Zanzibar ; and now that the facts were known, they might be quite sure that he would join in striking the fetters from the Slave, wherever the British flag flew, or wherever the British Protectorate extended. (Cheers.)

Mr. C. ERNEST TRITTON, M.P., heartily supported the resolution, and, as a Metropolitan member, and one who had long been connected with the City of London, was very glad that the Meeting had been held in the very heart of the Empire ; he believed that there were thousands in that City who sympathised with the efforts of the Society to put an end to Slavery. He believed that the Government was willing to carry out what was asked of them in the Resolution, and they would probably find Mr. MACKENZIE'S valuable report helpful by bringing truth to the hearts of many people who had hitherto known and perhaps cared little about the subject. (Cheers.)

The Motion was unanimously carried.

The Rev. HORACE WALLER proposed the next Resolution as follows :—

“That whereas it is computed that a quarter of a million of Slaves are at the present time engaged in working upon the plantations, or as porters, etc., in the islands of Zanzibar and Pemba, having first been enslaved in Central Africa under circumstances of the greatest barbarity—and nearly all of them taken to Zanzibar and Pemba illegally, in contravention of the SULTAN'S Decree of 1873 abolishing the Slave-trade—this Meeting would emphatically urge Her Majesty's Government to abolish the *status* of Slavery in Zanzibar and Pemba without further delay, inasmuch as the continuance of a state of Slavery necessarily leads to a corresponding activity in the Slave-trade.”

It was, he said, his fate years ago, as the friend and associate of Dr. LIVINGSTONE, to be on the spot where the Slave-trade was carried on. As he entered the room that afternoon a letter was put in his hand which was written twenty-three years ago by LORD GRANVILLE, who then deplored the very state of things which those present were still deploring. No one, therefore, should regard the present as a sudden movement ; it was merely a continuity of those “hammer blows” which had been delivered from year to year. There was not a Power in the world which would not accord to the English nation the first place in the efforts which had been made to do away with Slavery ; but at the present time they saw two islands, about the size of the Isle of Wight, full of Slaves and under a British protectorate. He could not agree with Mr. BOSWORTH SMITH regarding the question of compensation to these Slave-smugglers. (Cheers.) After testifying to the good work done by Mr. H. H. JOHNSTON in putting down Slavery, and expressing his conviction that their meeting that day would have due weight with the Government, he remarked that he had lived to see the extension of the Nyasaland Protectorate into a little colony of English coffee-growers, where free men came to work in thousands from a distance of 300 or 400 miles—

came because they knew that the British flag was there, and that there would be no tampering with the Slave-trade. (Cheers.) This should be the standing reply to those who said Africans would not work, if free.

Mr. WALLER's speech, coming rather late in the meeting, did not receive full justice from the gentlemen of the press. When he described the manner in which Slaves were treated when one of Her Majesty's cruisers came in sight, a thrill of horror went through the meeting as it heard that a common practice on board Slave canoes was to have large stones at the bottom to which cords were attached, and if there were danger of the canoe being overhauled, these cords were tied round the necks of the victims and they were quietly dropped to the bottom of the sea.

In front of the Chairman's table stood a very large wooden Slave yoke, presented to the BRITISH AND FOREIGN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY by Mr. JOSEPH A. WILLIAMS, lay missionary in Nyasa, and one of the Corresponding Members of the Society. It will be remembered that quite lately he and Bishop MAPLES were accidentally drowned in Lake Nyasa by the upsetting of their boat. Laying his hand upon this instrument of torture, Mr. WALLER said he was reminded that thirty years ago DAVID LIVINGSTONE and he had cut Slaves free from just such yokes as that now exhibited to the meeting. This interesting reminiscence produced a perceptible effect upon the large audience.

Mr. E. WRIGHT BROOKS seconded the Motion. He remarked, that to all intents and purposes the British Government owned the islands of Zanzibar and Pemba, and the sole reason why the hollow fiction of an Independent Mohammedan Sultanate was preserved, was that the hateful and abominable system of Slavery should not be interfered with. Under British law the flag of Britain cannot wave over a Slave, and therefore a Mohammedan flag is hoisted in Zanzibar ; but what is its Government ?

The President of the Ministry is General Sir LLOYD WILLIAM MATHEWS, formerly an officer in the British Navy, and still responsible only to the British Government through the Consul-General ; officers in command of native troops, Brigadier-General G. P. HATCH and Lieutenant A. E. H. RAIKES, who are also British officers; Treasurer and Collector of Revenues, C. W. STRICKLAND ; Minister of Public Works, BOMANJEE MANEKJEE ; Post Officer, Captain AGNEW, R.N.R. ; Health Officer, Dr. FRANCIS CHARLES-WORTH.

These are not *some* of the members of the Zanzibar Government, but the *whole* of them. I ask then, *whose* Government is it ? Is it the Government of an Independent Sovereign, or is it a British Administration ? To ask that question is to answer it. That being so, I say we are all, as members of the British nation, personally responsible for that *sum of all villainies*—Slavery—under our jurisdiction.

The nation has been pledged to its abolition ever since 1834. All parties in the present Parliament renewed their pledge to a like issue in the last session of Parliament. How much longer are we to await its fulfilment?

The Motion was carried unanimously.

Dr. LEITNER, in proposing a vote of thanks to the Chairman for his admirable conduct in the chair, said that he and the Society would have to weigh the *pros* and *cons* of the question of compensation to the Slave-owners of Zanzibar and Pemba. Much as Dr. LEITNER admired the speech, learning and principles of Mr. BOSWORTH SMITH, he differed from him on that question. He considered that, *under the circumstances of the case*, these Slave-owners were not entitled to any compensation even by the Mohammedan law, for the essential conditions of the legality of the acquisition of their Slaves were wanting under that Code, not to speak of ours, which their owners or captors had defied with their eyes open. The whole question should be gone into thoroughly at the next (he hoped an early) meeting of the ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY, when attention would be drawn to, if possible, a worse state of things elsewhere under British auspices—one which outraged alike the causes of humanity, religion, and learning. Not only the prestige but the interests also of the British Empire and nation depended on the honest adherence of our Government to those Anti-Slavery principles that had gained us the support of the best minds all over the world, and he hoped that an influential meeting, such as the one he was addressing, would insist on their being carried out in that quarter also to which he was drawing attention. (Cheers.)

Mr. W. H. WYLDE, C.M.G., seconded the Motion in a short but impressive speech.

Resolutions were passed thanking the LORD MAYOR for the use of the Hall and regretting his absence, and thanks to all the gentlemen who had taken part in the meeting, the following gentlemen speaking to the Resolutions: Mr. W. WILBERFORCE BAYNES and Mr. W. H. LEFEVRE.

Rev. PAULUS MOORT, M.D., of Liberia, a native of that Republic, gave a short but very eloquent address just as the meeting was breaking up. He cordially thanked the BRITISH AND FOREIGN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY for its long-continued and often successful exertions on behalf of his suffering brethren in Africa. He stated, with evident pride, that his father had been a Slave and had fought for his freedom, which he had successfully achieved: therefore he himself represented the very people on whose behalf the Society was so nobly working.

Opinions of the Press.

(The headings are those of the Journals quoted.)

Westminster Gazette. "A CHANCE FOR MR. CHAMBERLAIN."

THE public meeting on the Slave-trade in Africa held at the Mansion House yesterday, under the auspices of the BRITISH AND FOREIGN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY, raises in its acutest form the conflict between abstract morality and concrete convenience. In the abstract no Englishman would entertain the smallest doubt about the rightness of these two propositions :—

(1.) The British flag shall not fly over Slavery.

(2.) Every Slave shall be a free man so soon as he comes under the British flag.

The principles herein contained have been our special pride since the beginning of the century, and by our influence we have enforced them on the civilised world. Yet for the last five years the British flag has, for all intents and purposes, flown over the Island of Zanzibar without let or hindrance to the institution of domestic Slavery in that country. On the contrary, two successive Governments have practically declared that immediate emancipation is impossible without involving ourselves in a large expenditure, and the island probably in economic ruin. Not only does the Mohammedan population regard it as an institution sanctioned by religion and immemorial practice, but the entire life of the people, industrial and domestic, is alleged to depend on it. Sir LLOYD MATHEWS, the SULTAN OF ZANZIBAR's Prime Minister, contends that if the Slaves were manumitted the plantations would go out of cultivation; and others assert that the Arab owners would transfer themselves and their trade to German territory, where a mild form of Slavery is still permitted to exist. These fears and jealousies are probably exaggerated, but it is at least certain that any sudden emancipation would cause a serious upheaval in Zanzibar, and perhaps compel us to take much more active measures to assert our authority. So we have hitherto consulted convenience, sheltered ourselves under the nominal rule of the SULTAN, and salved our consciences by occasional benevolent manumissions with the SULTAN's aid. Meanwhile, the diplomatists have prepared long reports pointing out the dangers of doing anything rash or sudden. Five years, it is urged in extenuation, is a very short time, and we cannot expect entirely to alter the social life of an ancient community at a moment's notice. To this view two successive Governments have assented, but the argument cannot last for ever, and the question now arises : What will be done by a third?

At first blush, it might be supposed that if the recent Liberal Government were obliged to let things be, the present Tory Government is not likely to do more. But this conclusion by no means follows, for the most masterful member of the "inner Cabinet," no less a person than Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, has himself taken a strong line on this very question, and so recently as March last protested against the continuance of the present *laissez-faire* policy. On March 9th Mr. J. A. PEASE raised a debate on the Supplementary Estimates as a protest against the recognition of the Slave-trade in Zanzibar, and Mr. CHAMBERLAIN on that occasion both spoke and voted with Mr. PEASE. One or two passages of his speech are of special importance at this moment :—

"Was it consistent with all that we had said and done in the past that what was practically the British flag should fly over Slavery? . . . If the Committee, by the vote of a large majority, showed the Government that there was a universal opinion on all sides of the House that the present state of things in the islands should come to a very speedy close, they would strengthen the hon. Baronet's (Sir E. GREY's) hands and the hands of his department to proceed in the direction which the

hon. Baronet had shadowed forth. The hon. Baronet had made a sort of appeal to the House—in was in that sense that he understood the hon. Baronet's allusion to the effect on the revenues of Zanzibar. He said to the House of Commons—‘If you now press us to put an end to Slavery in Zanzibar, we may have to come to you hereafter and ask for a vote of money.’ Let the Committee answer, that when he came for that money they would grant it. They would make an answer of that kind if they voted for this amendment.”

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN did vote for this amendment, and he, therefore, pledged himself to a policy of stopping the Slave-trade in Zanzibar, and finding the money. We have no desire to make this pledge a matter of political inconvenience to Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, and we shall not assume that he will run away from either his speech, his vote, or his willingness to find the money. We have often urged that Zanzibar should be placed under the Colonial Office, instead of the Foreign Office, and we would gladly see that done at once, and Mr. CHAMBERLAIN given a free hand. No member of the late Government consented willingly to the present half-and-half arrangement, and every Liberal in Opposition will be ready to lend a hand towards any scheme which may save our reputation and effect the transition in Zanzibar. What this scheme should be is too long a matter to enter into here, but for a beginning there is an immense deal to be said for Captain LUGARD's proposal of permissive freedom, that is, abolishing the legal status, while permitting all Slaves who chose of their own free will to remain on the old footing. This plan (which we have again and again urged in these columns) would affect the kind master but little, while it would be a potent remedy against the cruel one.—*Westminster Gazette*, October 15th, 1895.

The Globe.

“SLAVERY AND SLAVE-RAIDING.”

MR. DONALD MACKENZIE's speech at the Mansion House yesterday completely established the fact, if there had been any doubt, that Slavery, with all its attendant evils, is rampant in Zanzibar and Pemba. Nor can there be any doubt that while it continues, Slave-raiding on the African mainland will be a flourishing occupation. There are, according to Mr. MACKENZIE, over 260,000 Slaves in Zanzibar and 90,000 in Pemba. Unlike the negro race in general, these people have very few children, and as the numbers do not fall off, it follows that there must be a continuous importation from the continent. Under existing conditions this cannot be stopped, and we are not surprised to hear that not more than five or six per cent. of the recruits for the miserable army of bond-servants are ever rescued. There are two obstacles in the way. In the first place, any dhow carrying Slaves between Zanzibar and Pemba, and bearing a permit from the Zanzibar Government, is secure from capture by the Queen's ships. The SULTAN is naturally by no means eager to put an end to a system which is profitable to himself, inasmuch as he is the largest Slave-holder in his dominions, possessing, it appears, as many as 30,000. We can more easily deal with the SULTAN OF ZANZIBAR, however, than with the European Power which has the unique distinction of opposing British efforts to abolish the illegal trade. France continues to deny to our cruisers the right of search in the case of any vessel carrying French colours. It is evident, then, that the only way to put a stop to the traffic is to declare the existence of Slavery illegal within the limits of the British Protectorate. This should not be difficult if, as Mr. MACKENZIE contends, hardly any of the Slaves now held are legal property. In cases where legal possession can be proved, compensation ought undoubtedly to be paid to the owners, Mr. MACKENZIE's opinion to the contrary notwithstanding. We

are quite willing to believe, however, that such cases are few. It is certain, at any rate, that Slave-raiding will never be got rid of until Slavery is extinct.—*The Globe*, October 15, 1895.

The Daily News. "A NATIONAL DISGRACE."

THE BRITISH AND FOREIGN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY held a large and influential meeting at the Mansion House yesterday, in condemnation of the system under which the British flag covers Slavery and Slave-dealing at Zanzibar. The late Government expressed their willingness to act on adequate information; such information has been obtained by Mr. DONALD MACKENZIE, and it is at the service of their successors. Mr. MACKENZIE showed yesterday that there is as much Slavery as ever in Zanzibar and Pemba, and as much of the Slave-trade, in spite of our flag. Treaties have had no effect upon it, although our solemn pact with SAID BURGHASH, the late Sultan, pledged him to the abolition of the trade by sea throughout his dominions. Wishing to provide for the gradual extinction of the evil, and to show what was supposed to be a politic respect for vested interests, we agreed that bygones should be bygones in respect of the Slaves already existing in Zanzibar. The legal status of Slavery was to be acknowledged in regard to them, but their number was not to be augmented. That understanding has had just as much success as most time bargains with the Devil. As fast as the old Slaves die new ones are smuggled in. Mr. MACKENZIE holds that there is but one thing to do—abolish the legal status forthwith, for that is the root of the evil. The Arabs keep up the supply by their old device of Slave raids in the interior. The Slaves are "run" into the islands by dhows or by canoes; there are 90,000 of them in Pemba, and 266,000 in both islands, or more than half of the estimated total population of 400,000. This is not the worst. The Arabs drive a thriving trade in Slaves with Arabia, and any glut of production in the commodity which Zanzibar cannot take is easily worked off in the Persian Gulf.

Such is Mr. MACKENZIE's testimony, and he speaks by the card. He was sent to Pemba on a special mission by the BRITISH AND FOREIGN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY, and he saw what he describes. It is almost an unknown land, for the Arabs have taken care to spread the report that it has a deadly climate, in order to keep intruders out of their preserves. It has no such climate, and might easily be made a little earthly Paradise. Mr. MACKENZIE found Slaves everywhere in it, toiling in the rice fields, or in the clove plantations which form the staple industry. His point is that there is no need of all this infamy, and all this misery, to keep the world in cloves. They could be perfectly well grown by free labour, and would be so grown at once, if we declared our will. The only "interests" that stand in the way are those sham ones which could easily be adjusted to a new set of circumstances, and to the fiat of the governing power. We are directly responsible. Many of our own kith and kin recognise the detestable institution, by means of convenient fictions which enable them to evade the law. They cannot hold Slaves themselves, but they can hire them as "free labourers," though they are perfectly well aware that one-half of their earnings go to the Arab owners. The natives of British India, who finance the islands, are at the bottom of the whole business. They lend money on the estates, and recognise the Slaves as a principal asset for security. Nothing will do but to lay the axe at the root of the evil, as we did in India and on the West Coast. Gradual abolition has been tried, and we see what has come of it. The temporary recognition of the status has proved a permanent one, and there will be no end to the Slavery

and the Slave-trading while there is a status to recognise. It is a colossal crime as it stands. So much of the raw material is "wasted" every year in the passage from the interior that the 266,000 effective Slaves in Zanzibar and Pemba are said to represent an actual sacrifice of over a million souls. Something has to be done, and while we are about it, it had better be the right thing. There is but one way in such a business, and that is the shortest. The late Government admitted as much in the debate of last March. The present one has to redeem the promises then made, and to clear the national name of a foul reproach. We can no longer wink at an abomination of this sort existing under our own flag.—*The Daily News*, October 15th, 1895.

The Spectator.

"THE BLACK QUESTION."

LORD SALISBURY must make up his mind, and that quickly, as to what he will do in the Black question. The facts are coming out, and when they have once filtered into the British mind, he will find that the electors will become restless, and will insist on action, which, if the Government is not ready, will probably be unwise. The matter is not one which only concerns philanthropists, or that exceedingly limited class which acknowledges no distinctions of colour, race, or capacity for self-government. The average British voter holds, as we do, that the gradations of capacity among human beings are almost infinite, but that no human being is entitled to hold Slaves or to torture other human beings for gain, and that within the British dominion such practices ought not to be tolerated under any excuses whatever. Moreover, he holds himself bound, if it is physically possible, to prevent atrocities being committed by Christians anywhere; or if he cannot prevent them, to protest in such a way as to move the opinion of the civilised world. Two stories are told this week which, at all events, appear to be true, and which, if true, demand the immediate interference of the Foreign Office. The one closest to us is the story of the Slaves in Zanzibar. It is stated, on authority which cannot be questioned, that there are a hundred and forty thousand Slaves in Zanzibar and Pemba, that is in a dominion which is as much ours as Guiana or Jamaica, of whom all but five per cent. are captives, men and women stolen from their homes by Arab raiders, and sold to the planters and employers of the two islands. These British subjects are held in true Slavery, forced to work by savage discipline, imprisoned in British prisons if they run away, sold from planter to planter, and transferred from island to island under permits which are as much British as if LORD SALISBURY had signed them. If they belong to citizens of the towns their employers steal half their wages, if to planters in the country they steal all, giving nothing in return for labour but bare food. In Zanzibar the Slaves have right of appeal against cruelty, which, says Mr. MACKENZIE, who saw it all on the spot, they are too ignorant and too timid to use; but in Pemba there is no limit whatever on the masters' authority; they can inflict even death. The system is supported by capital from India, and by the opinion of most officials on the spot—not all, thank God—and is practically defended by British gunboats, and is the worst officially proved instance we have ever come across of British hypocrisy. We are always declaring that we are hostile to Slavery, that no Slave can breathe under the British flag; we keep up a whole squadron to put down Slavery on the African coast, and then the very moment it is convenient or profitable, we not only tolerate, but actually help to promote the offence which in Parliament we declare to be equal to piracy. It is intolerable, and we do not believe that if the question is once raised in the House of Commons the situation will be endured for an hour. Unionists are not

accomplices of Slave-holders any more than Liberals, or more disposed to use the irresistible strength of Britain to keep up that concentration of all the villainies. The Foreign Office, which still rules in Zanzibar, should act before the meeting of Parliament, and inform all officials under its orders that Slavery as a legal status must cease at once, that no Court can recognise the condition, that no gaoler can hold a prisoner charged only with escaping, that no tribunal can refuse a claim for redress against assault or robbery of wages simply because the plaintiff is a Slave. That decree once promulgated will end the system at once, as it did in India. Its advocates say the Slaves love Slavery, and, of course, if they think so, they have no right to protest, for a much-loved system does not need the support of the lash, the chain, or the prison. If the Slaves are content with the robbery of their wages, which is the sole motive of Slavery, so be it, they can work, if they please, for nothing; but it is not our business to see that when they work they shall receive only food. As for the economic disturbance which the decree will produce, we simply disbelieve in it; and as to the danger of insurrection, we reply that the Slaves are half the population, and every man of them would be on the side of the emancipating Government. As to compensation, we are willing, if it be necessary, to vote any moderate sum in order to avoid social trouble; but of moral claim the Arab planters have simply none whatever. They stole the Slaves, or bought them, against British law, from the stealers. These difficulties are always raised by those who at heart either approve Slavery, or think it essential to profit, and they always vanish when the final order has gone forth and has reached the ears of the emancipated population. Even in Brazil society has not been overturned by emancipation, nor has cultivation ended or seriously decreased. . . . —*The Spectator*, October 19th, 1895.

The Speaker.

"OUR SLAVES AT ZANZIBAR."

WE are a funny people, and it is not surprising that foreigners laugh at us. We have a burning desire to set everything right everywhere, but we manage to view sin very differently when the sin is our own. Our newspapers grow quite eloquent in denouncing Governor TILLMAN'S plan for disfranchising the negroes in South Carolina, but we have not a word to say against the Glen Grey Act at the Cape. We throw stones at the French because Slavery still flourishes in some parts of the vast territory they have acquired in Western Africa, but we have Slave plantations of our own at Pemba and Zanzibar. It is not in any way an exaggeration to say that Pemba and Zanzibar are our own. They are nominally under the dominion of the SULTAN OF ZANZIBAR, and only protected by us. But we are really as supreme there as are the French in Tunis, or as we are ourselves in the smallest protected State of British India. An Englishman commands the SULTAN'S armies; the English Resident can do just as he likes; British-Indian subjects finance the plantations, and in all but name own the Slaves. Nor can it be pleaded that there is any physical difficulty in seeing that our will is obeyed. Pemba and Zanzibar are islands of moderate size. With the help of one-half the force which we have allowed General MATHEWS and Mr. HARDINGE to use to hunt down the runaway Slaves from the SULTAN'S Dominions on the mainland, who have gathered round the outlaw M'BARUK, we could crush any attempt that the owners of plantations might make to resist our will. Thus the Slaves at Zanzibar are kept by us in Slavery—by us, by the British people—and they are our Slaves. That is the plain and ugly fact, try to wriggle out of it how we may.

What is more, the Slavery is peculiarly horrible in its nature, and unjustifiable in its history. It is not a matter of long custom, of ingrained social habit. It is not to any large extent domestic Slavery. It is plantation Slavery, the Slavery of negroes stolen from their homes in the interior for the express purpose of being used as Slaves in British dominions, and treated as Arabs are wont to treat subject races. The SULTAN OF ZANZIBAR engaged by treaty in 1873—when we first assumed some sort of responsibility for the integrity of his dominions—that no Slaves should be allowed to be imported. It was blandly supposed that when the existing Slaves died the institution would die with them. But the number of Slaves has nevertheless been constantly and steadily increasing, and even Sir LLOYD MATHEWS admits that the large majority of the 140,000 Slaves now to be found there are subsequent importations, and are consequently held illegally. British ships patrol the coasts, and they have been so successful as to catch about one dhow in twenty, and the Arab dealers have even been driven to use canoes instead of dhows to escape detection when they bring the victims of the Slave raid to the profitable market under British protection. This is as much as the British sailors could have been expected to do. So long as Slaves can be disposed of at big prices to work on the clove plantations at Pemba, homes by the shores of Lake Nyassa will be ravaged to supply the demand. It is part of those inevitable laws of supply and demand which Englishmen have done so much to teach mankind. The Arab escapes with some difficulty from our Sikhs and bluejackets by the Shiré River, and doubtless hits the Slave the harder in the effort to avoid them. He brings them down through a long stretch of Portuguese territory, where the risk of capture is small and the Slave's sufferings comparatively light. He coops them into a canoe in some pestilential creek by the coast near Pemba, and runs them over when the British ships are not about. But he risks his life and the Slaves' lives, and makes himself into a human brute, simply and solely because he knows that if he once lands the Slaves in Pemba he will be able to dispose of them at good prices to planters who are enabled to pay those prices by the admirable security which they enjoy under the protecting arm of Great Britain. In other countries where Slavery is allowed life and property are insecure, markets are far-distant, and even a Slave-owning planter will generally fail to grow rich. But England sees to it that there shall be no insecurity in Pemba, and the Pemba Arabs can thus afford to pay high prices for their Slaves, and therefore the dealers by Lake Nyassa think it worth while to run great risks.

The whole chain of cause and effect is so plain and unmistakable, and the facts are so indisputable, that it is a matter of the deepest disgrace that no one of the three Foreign Ministers whom we have had since 1890 has seriously grappled with the evil. We confess that we are unable to defend the conduct of the late Government in this matter. It was only under strong pressure, frequently repeated, that they even went so far as to call for a report as to how Slavery could be put down. They went out of office without having done anything except call for Mr. HARDINGE's report and enunciate some excellent general principles. In three years they might surely have done more. They allowed their representatives at Zanzibar to find time to organise more than one punitive expedition against the Slaves on the mainland who had run away from Mombasa. But if the late Government is not free from blame, the present Government will, if they fail to act, be much more blameworthy. There was a critical moment last spring, when it seemed only too likely that the Government would go out on this question of Slavery. Mr. CHAMBERLAIN made a bitter attack on Sir EDWARD GREY, and would not listen to his somewhat too official plea for

further time. The case seemed so clear that many Radicals were ready to vote against the Government. Mr. CHAMBERLAIN can scarcely have forgotten that speech. It was bitter, but not altogether an unreasonable speech, quite different, for instance, from that which he made on the question of prison-made goods. He hit the nail on the head when he said that it was all a question of money. This is mercantile Slavery. The Slave is not a member of the household; he is a possession, an instrument of manufacture. It is as easy to buy out the Arab owner compulsorily as it was to buy out the Birmingham Gas Company. Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, the Minister, will surely not haggle about the money. Mr. HANBURY, the Secretary to the Treasury, who is one of the guardians of the public purse, told the House of Commons on the same occasion that he had himself travelled in those parts, and knew of the horrors of the trade which we encourage. He will doubtless assist Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Now that the facts collected by Mr. DONALD MACKENZIE for the BRITISH AND FOREIGN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY are made public, we shall be exceedingly disappointed if the Government do not meet Parliament with a complete scheme of liberation.

The only even specious argument for inaction is that used by Mr. CURZON: that the whole question of Slavery in British East Africa must be considered and dealt with at one time; that it is impossible with the means of Government now at our command to liberate all the Slaves between Mombasa and the lakes, and that the railway must be made first. All this may be true, though we believe it to be a good deal exaggerated, but it does not touch the point. The Slavery between Mombasa and the lakes is domestic Slavery, existing in a country of wide area and unsettled character. The Slavery in Zanzibar is chiefly plantation Slavery, and it exists in a country of small area completely within our power. As for the railway between Mombasa and Uganda, it scarcely affects the question at all. Few of the Slaves for the Zanzibar market are brought through British East Africa, or from the Nile basin. They come through the partly-explored territory belonging to Portugal which lies to the south. The Mombasa-Uganda Railway is, in this controversy, a mere red herring. We must keep to the point, and abolish this British Slave market.—*The Speaker*, 19th October.

The Christian Million. "SLAVERY UNDER THE BRITISH FLAG."

In a recent number we called attention to the existence of Slavery in Pemba and Zanzibar. During the week details have been made public of a most saddening character. It is very evident that our officers in those parts have shrunk from dealing firmly with the Slavery question. At the present time there are one hundred and forty-four thousand Slaves under the British flag in Zanzibar and Pemba. Think of it! That flag which has been the proud emblem of freedom, waving over chained and imprisoned Slaves. Mr. MACKENZIE, whose reports we gave after he had examined into the facts at Pemba, himself tells us that these Slaves have no security against death; that many of them are in British prisons against whom there is no charge save that of attempting to gain their freedom; and that only five per cent. of them were born in Slavery, the rest being free men and women stolen by the raiders. It is enough to make CLARKSON and WILBERFORCE turn in their graves. Capital from India maintains it, and British generals defend it. We keep up a fleet to put down Slavery on the African coast, and then in these islands, for commercial reasons, actually promote it. It is absolutely intolerable, and must cease. When the matter is brought before the House of Commons, as it will be, it will not be endured for a

moment. But it must end before then, and LORD SALISBURY will do well to anticipate such action. The Foreign Office must act before Parliament meets; Zanzibar and Pemba officials must be informed that Slavery has no legal status where the British flag waves. The system can at once be ended, and ended it must be.—*Christian Million*, October 26, 1895.

MR. DONALD MACKENZIE's paper on "Slavery in Zanzibar and Pemba" calls to mind a debate which took place in the House of Commons on March 8th. Mr. J. A. PEASE moved a reduction of the Estimates by way of protest against the late Government's failure to put an end to Slavery in these islands. Sir EDWARD GREY promised fresh efforts, and declared, on behalf of the Government, that "we had now arrived at a position in regard to these islands in which the Government would be justified in insisting that the time during which Slavery should exist there should be very limited indeed." Mr. PEASE, determined enemy of Slavery as he is, was satisfied, and asked leave to withdraw his amendment, "after the declaration of the Under-Secretary that this system of Slavery had to be terminated." Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, however, went further, and pressed for the reduction of the vote, asking, "Was it consistent with all that we had said and done in the past that what was practically the British flag should fly over Slavery?" The amendment was accordingly forced to a division. Mr. CHAMBERLAIN is now in office as the director of Unionist Colonial policy, and this is really a question of Colonial policy, though Zanzibar and Pemba are formally controlled by the Foreign Office. We hope that he will make his convictions felt. The Unionist papers yesterday were pretty unanimous in slighting Mr. MACKENZIE's paper as a product of "loose philanthropy." It was not that. Mr. MACKENZIE defended an ideal of policy which it would be disgraceful for Englishmen, of all people, to reject. He made somewhat light of some practical obstacles to its attainment, obstacles which Sir EDWARD GREY explained to the House of Commons on March 8. But on March 8 Mr. CHAMBERLAIN made so light of those obstacles, too, that he pressed a virtual vote of censure on a Government which had not overleapt them at once. Will he and his friends overleap them now, or will they meet the "loose philanthropists" in the House of Commons with a repetition of Sir EDWARD GREY's explanations and promises? If they take the latter course, the light thrown on Mr. CHAMBERLAIN's tactics of last March will be unpleasant. If they can and will take the former, we shall be sincerely glad, and shall give Mr. CHAMBERLAIN credit for his determination to draw the sword, as well as blow the horn, in a matter touching our national reputation.—*Manchester Guardian*, October 16, 1895.

DESPITE any and every excuse which may be put forward, the British people will surely not long permit Slavery to exist in any part of the dominions which come under their authority. It is true that Zanzibar is not directly under our rule, but for all practical purposes Great Britain is immediately and directly responsible for all that transpires there. We are told on the authority of Mr. MACKENZIE, who has investigated the subject on the spot, that no inconsiderable proportion of the population of the islands of Zanzibar and Pemba are Slaves. The worst feature of the traffic is the recruiting which takes place on the mainland. These island Slaves do not, like the blacks in general, multiply largely, and as the numbers are kept up, recourse has to be had to recruiting on the mainland. Harmless as the word appears in some of its uses, as applied to the Slave-trade, it recalls all the horrors of the traffic in human flesh. With the SULTAN OF ZANZIBAR's permit, and the refusal of the French to allow the right of

search to any vessel flying the flag of the Republic, the traffic flourishes, and all its weight of human misery and suffering calls aloud to the generous British people, who have already done so much to put down this practice, for redress. We could easily deal with the SULTAN OF ZANZIBAR. He must do as we will. And the dhows which use the French flag and drag the name of a kind-hearted, warm, and impulsive people in the mire can also be dealt with. We can if we will spoil their market. There are more ways than one of dealing with traffic of this kind. If, owing to the French pride, we cannot confiscate the cargoes, we can, and should, spoil the markets for the goods. If there were no markets there would be no traffic. It is only the demand which calls forth the supply. We can in Zanzibar declare Slave-holding illegal, and free ourselves from the stain of having any part or lot, even indirectly, with the Slave-trade in any part of the world in which we may have influence. This is what we can do, and there is no doubt we shall do it. But we should like to see it done sooner rather than later.—*Huddersfield Chronicle*, October 17, 1895.

IN the movement for the suppression of Slavery in Zanzibar, Mr. ARTHUR PEASE, M.P., is taking an active and a commendable part. His speech at the meeting of the BRITISH AND FOREIGN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY, held in London yesterday, was a valuable contribution to what has already been said on the subject. For whatever form of Slavery exists in Zanzibar we are responsible. It is, therefore, desirous that England should take some immediate action to put a stop to domestic Slavery. So long as it is tolerated, so long will there be a demand for Slaves, and so long will the brutal and unscrupulous Arabs find it profitable to kidnap the natives of the interior and bring them on those dreadful and deadly marches to the coast.—*North-Eastern Daily Gazette*, October 15, 1895.

"SLAVERY UNDER THE BRITISH FLAG."

A MONTH or two back we quoted largely from the invaluable report of Mr. MACKENZIE, dealing in detail with the prevalence of Slavery in Zanzibar and other districts of Eastern Africa. LORD SALISBURY, who is every day adding fresh laurels to his fame as a Foreign Minister by the determined stand he has made in relation to difficulties in other quarters of the globe, must without delay turn his attention to this question, than which none can be more urgent or pressing. And in appealing to LORD SALISBURY we ask if it is necessary that he should wait until he has obtained Cabinet and Parliamentary support before taking action. If the facts are as stated by eye-witnesses, is it not enough for him to proceed to make short work of what is to all intents and purposes a violation of the constitution? Once on British soil every Slave is free—that is the principle. A British Consul's office, the deck of a British man-of-war, are "British soil." But in Zanzibar and Pemba, both in the British Dominions, there are a hundred and forty thousand Slaves, and numbers of these are constantly being savagely treated and imprisoned if they attempt to gain freedom. It is a hideous scandal to which we must put a speedy end.—*Family Churchman*, October 25, 1895.

THERE was a good deal of vitality in the protest made yesterday by the BRITISH AND FOREIGN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY, at the London Mansion House, against the continuance of Slavery and the Slave-trade at Zanzibar. It is, perhaps, a pity that Mr. CHAMBERLAIN could not be induced to attend. His views, especially if expressed with the vigour which marked his criticisms while LORD ROSEBERY was in power,

would have been decidedly interesting. But politicians of light and leading were conspicuous by their absence, and the meeting was practically in the hands of the philanthropists. Mr. DONALD MACKENZIE, the Commissioner sent out by the Society to investigate the condition of the Slave-trade in Zanzibar and Pemba, made an interesting and convincing statement as to the evils which are permitted to go on under the very eyes of the British Government. Mr. MACKENZIE declared that so long as the legal status of Slavery was recognised, so long would Slave-raiding inevitably go on—a state of things insulting to the power and traditions of this country. Mr. J. A. PEASE, M.P., and other speakers addressed the meeting, and resolutions were carried calling upon the British Government to put an end to the existing state of things without delay.—*Leeds Mercury*, October 15, 1895.

THE BRITISH AND FOREIGN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY held on Monday a meeting at the Mansion House to promote the suppression of Slavery in the British Protectorate of Zanzibar and Pemba. It is a good thing that this vigilant society has no intention of letting our Government rest on the subject. The question is hedged about with so many difficulties and worries that the Government might almost be pardoned for not dealing with the question, and it certainly will not take vigorous action unless supported by a strong expression of public feeling. That the status of Slavery should be done away with as little delay as possible, every Englishman who is worthy of the name must grant.—*Rock*, October 18, 1895.

ON Monday the BRITISH AND FOREIGN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY put before the country the fact that in Zanzibar and Pemba, which are entirely under British control, the institution of Slavery is allowed to exist. Mr. DONALD MACKENZIE, who has been employed by the Society to investigate the state of affairs in Zanzibar and Pemba, argued that the only way to put down Slave-raiding is to refuse to recognise the status of serfdom. For it is a known fact that, while the number of births in the Slave population tends to decrease, the ranks of the Slaves are kept full. The Protectorate of Zanzibar is an exception to the otherwise universal British policy, that every man, woman, and child shall be free wherever the British flag floats, and the sooner our Government washes the foul blot from off its administration the better for the fair name of England.—*Church Times*, October 10, 1895.

THERE IS no country which has taken a more prominent and honourable position in the cause of humanity than England. With the objects of the meeting which was held in the Mansion House, London, last night, under the auspices of the BRITISH AND FOREIGN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY, the people of these realms will have peculiar sympathy. At this meeting attention was called to the existence of Slavery in Zanzibar, and a resolution passed in reference thereto. The meeting was addressed by Mr. DONALD MACKENZIE, than whom there is no person better qualified to speak on this subject. It was this gentleman whom the Society sent out as a Special Commissioner to inquire into the state of Slavery in the British Protectorate of Zanzibar, as well as in Pemba, an island almost hitherto unexplored. . . . Considering the rights we now exercise over Zanzibar and Pemba, this country must be held responsible for the state of things to which we are calling attention. We shall not have done all that is required of us until we have used all the influence and authority at our command to put an end to a condition of affairs which is a disgrace to humanity.

Mr. MACKENZIE states that since we assumed responsibilities in Zanzibar and Pemba no improvement has been made in the condition of the Slaves. "British cruisers have, to some extent, checked the importation of Slaves into Zanzibar and Pemba, but the final issue of the case against the Sultan's steamer, the *Kilwa*, without doubt disheartened British officers in their crusade against the Slave-trade; at all events, they have not been so energetic since." We are interesting ourselves on behalf of the Christian population of Armenia, and appealing to the Sultan in their defence. Surely it is no less our duty to manifest some sympathy on behalf of the thousands of men and women who are kept in a sort of legal bondage, and that in territories over which we exercise supreme rights. There are, no doubt, difficulties in the way, but they should not be insurmountable. Englishmen abhor Slavery; and we have the traditions of our race to sustain. A favourable opportunity occurs now. The Government could gain no nobler laurels than in the cause of humanity. The resolution carried at the Mansion House meeting calls upon the Government to abolish the legal status of Slavery in Zanzibar and Pemba. We are sure the Government could not take a step more congenial to the feelings of Englishmen than by doing so.—*The Belfast News-Letter*, October 15, 1895.

"SLAVERY UNDER OUR FLAG."

It is impossible to over-estimate the importance of the meeting summoned by the BRITISH AND FOREIGN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY yesterday. There is flourishing in Zanzibar, under the British flag, a system of Slavery on a large scale. There is not room for two opinions as to what ought to be, and therefore must be, done. The abominable thing must be abolished root and branch, without any temporising or compromise. The immediate purpose of yesterday's meeting was to lay before the public the authentic information gathered by Mr. DONALD MACKENZIE, who was lately commissioned by the BRITISH AND FOREIGN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY to investigate on the spot the condition of the Slaves in the islands of Zanzibar and Pemba. It will be remembered that when the subject was discussed in the House of Commons last spring, Sir W. HARCOURT pledged himself and his colleagues to lose no time in the work of abolition. That was only what was to be expected. But the Government was waiting for full information from our representatives on the spot as to ways and means. The wheels of Government inquiry grind slowly, and the BRITISH AND FOREIGN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY did well to send out without delay an independent and thoroughly trustworthy Commissioner to inquire and report.

° ° ° ° °

It is hopeless to attempt to make terms with this fiendish traffic. In spite of existing prohibition, it is computed that at least 6,000 Slaves are imported into Zanzibar and Pemba from the mainland every year. Moreover, for every Slave that is brought alive to the plantations, four others perish miserably on the way. This condition of affairs, existing under the British flag, is such as may well fill every Englishman with dismay. Those who derive profit from the inhuman traffic think, perhaps, that their chattels, being out of sight, are also out of mind. That is not the tradition of this country so far as Slavery is concerned. Upon other questions there may be mutual hostility or indifference among our people. But men of all parties and all creeds will loyally unite in removing from the British name the odious stigma of Slavery. It is for the Government to take action, and that speedily.—*The Star*, October 15, 1895.

It is a disgraceful and humiliating fact that a country like England, which has sacrificed so much for the purpose of abolishing Slavery, should at the present time ignore, if it does not actually sanction, the existence of the traffic in the British Protectorate of Zanzibar and Pemba. This was the chief object of attention on the part of the BRITISH AND FOREIGN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY, which met in the Egyptian Hall of the Mansion House on Monday, under the presidency of Mr. ARTHUR PEASE, M.P., and it is clear from the attitude of that body that whatever may be the upshot of their endeavours they are determined to leave no stone unturned until they have aroused the Government to a sense of their responsibility, and to a determination so to act that Slavery shall be no longer tolerated in Zanzibar or elsewhere. In this the Society will have the thanks, as they will certainly have the sympathy, of the British public. . . . A condition of things such as this is greatly to be deplored, and it is surprising that it should have been permitted so long, but it only requires to be properly brought under the notice of the public to awaken a storm of righteous indignation. If there is one thing above another on which an Englishman is sensitive, and which is calculated to immediately arouse his temper, it is the mere suggestion of Slavery being tolerated under the British flag. As an instance of this it is only necessary to recall the celebrated circular from the Admiralty concerning the surrendering of fugitive Slaves on board British ships to their owners, which was so severely censured at the time by the public that it had to be withdrawn. The only effective remedy for the existing state of things in Zanzibar is manifestly to abolish the status of Slavery altogether, and sufficient pressure ought to be brought to bear on the Government to do this. Assurances have, it appears, been received from both the late and the present Government that this matter shall receive careful attention, but meanwhile nothing is done, and the wretched traffic in human beings continues undisturbed. If, however, the members of the ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY, the members of Parliament, and the public generally, combine in an earnest protest against this Slave-dealing, we have no doubt the Government will soon see it to be their duty to suppress the traffic.—*Wolverhampton Chronicle*, October 16, 1895.

SLAVERY at Zanzibar must be put down. Mr. H. M. STANLEY has indicated by his speeches in the Commons that he is a new accession to the ranks of the tolerators of this abomination under British protection. He pleads for time to arrange the matter as in the Congo State. There has been time enough since our first identification with Zanzibar to settle this business. We have power to bring the matter to a satisfactory issue, and as a Christian nation we are bound to do it. We cannot free ourselves from a terrible responsibility in this case.—*Freeman* (The Rev. J. HUNT COOKE, *Editor*), August 30, 1895.

A SADDENING story was told at the meeting of the ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY on Monday. It is perfectly clear that our officers in Zanzibar, like our officers formerly in the West Indies, have shrunk from dealing firmly with the Slavery question. They fear not insurrection, but an economic crash. There are, therefore, 140,000 Slaves in Zanzibar and Pemba under the British flag, of whom only 50,000 are protected even against cruelty by an imaginary right of appeal to the Consul-General; the remaining 90,000 being left absolutely to the discretion of Arab masters. Mr. MACKENZIE, who has personally examined the facts in Pemba, reports that they have no security even against death; that he found Slaves in the prisons, against whom there was no charge but flight; and that only five per cent. of the Slaves were born so, the rest being free

men and women stolen by the raiders. We think we may trust the House of Commons to do justice in this matter, and LORD SALISBURY will do well to anticipate the vote. Let him order, as the Court of Directors did, that no official, Court, or gaoler, in Zanzibar, shall recognise the status of Slavery, and the iniquity will end at once. He may rely on it that for every lash given or fugitive murdered, we shall have in the end to pay, as the Americans did. Our justification for conquering in Africa, which is otherwise pure dacoity, is that we set up a vivifying Government. A Slave-holding Government is not that, but the reverse of that.—*Spectator, Editorial Note*, October 19, 1895.

If the statements made at the meeting of the BRITISH AND FOREIGN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY on Monday evening are well founded, there is yet much to be done before Englishmen can truthfully say that their country has no complicity in the Slave-trade. The Society has caused a personal investigation to be made into the Slave-trade of Zanzibar and Pemba on the spot, with the result of demonstrating the fact that the horrors of the traffic are carried on in circumstances which throw a large share of responsibility on the British Government. We hope that the high aspirations of the Tories, and especially of the Liberal Unionists, when they were in opposition, may be realised now that they are in power. Slave-raiding, with all its horrors—the stealing of children from their parents, the shooting down of inoffensive natives, the driving of poor wretches heavily manacled over long distances which prove fatal to many of them, and the selling of human flesh and blood like oxen, takes place to supply with Slaves a market in which Britain is all-powerful. That is the report of the Society's Commissioner. The Government should be urged in an effective manner to wipe away this disgrace and dishonour to the British race.—*Huddersfield Examiner*, October 15, 1895.

Christian Leader. "BRITISH COUNTEenance OF SLAVERY."

THE material selfishness of mankind is a perpetual danger and barrier to the freedom and elevation of inferior races. CLARKSON, WILBERFORCE, and BUXTON created a British tradition in favour of the abolition of Slavery; but the principle can only be maintained against indolent possession, the love of gain, and the fear of loss by constant watchfulness and endeavour. There is little doubt that the utter collapse of Hovan opposition to the French in Madagascar was caused in large measure by the fact that Slavery and the *corvée* have throttled alike the enterprise of leaders and the effectiveness of the troops. Such an object lesson as this should not be lost sight of in dealing with Zanzibar, the Protectorate of which island is secured to Great Britain, as that of Madagascar is ceded to France. Whatever immediate material advantages the SULTAN, with his supporters—and we regret to learn that Englishmen in high office have to be ranked with such—may imagine they secure by the present toleration of Slavery, and the encouragement of the trade, there is always to be set against it the degeneration of morals and the deterioration of spirit that inevitably accompany and follow the sale or purchase and the bondage of one's fellows. Happily, the ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY is composed of men who have learnt patience, and are ever on the alert to report the evils that arise wherever their principles are not brought into practice, especially when the effectual application of the principle has been agreed to and yet is not enforced. This has been the case in Zanzibar, where the Slave-trade has been condemned as illegal, but thrives in spite of prohibition. Importation of Slaves, Mr. DONALD MACKENZIE, the Special Commissioner

of the Society to Zanzibar, reminds us, was forbidden by the Treaty of 1873; nevertheless it has not been abandoned, and not less than six thousand Slaves are brought into the country every year. In the population of 400,000 there are 266,000 Slaves, of whom the SULTAN himself owns 30,000; and the numbers do not diminish as they should, considering the low birth-rate in enslaved families. The Sultanate includes the island of Pemba as well as that of Zanzibar; Arabs owning Slaves have the right to send them from one island to the other to cultivate their estates; under pretence of transferring labour in this manner, they are able to run cargoes of Slaves into the market for them which is still to be found in the Persian Gulf. The surreptitious traffic makes another drain on the Slave population, which is always a valuable asset when loans are required from British-Indian financiers, and there is no way of making up the losses but by smuggling fresh ones into the country—an illegal proceeding at which the SULTAN for property reasons with his thousands and others, including Sir LLOYD MATHEWS, his Prime Minister, and Mr. HARDINGE, for political and commercial reasons, wink at as rather desirable than otherwise. To justify their negligence in this matter, the assertion is made that free labourers cannot be had in sufficient numbers, and if they could they would not work. On the contrary, a leading merchant declares that in the town there is no such difficulty whatever; "freed Slaves," he says, "are regular labourers." The result of the SULTAN's failure to suppress the trade is calamitous in its bearing on the larger question of the traffic in the interior of the African Continent. To place the standing number of a quarter of a million Slaves in the island it must have been necessary to slaughter a million blacks in the interior—we follow Mr. MACKENZIE, who may well describe it as "an appalling amount of sacrifice of human life"—and to supply the annual deficit a slaughter of 24,000 is requisite in addition to the 40,000 for those from whom the Arabian trade is supplied. This fearful mortality of four out of five, purchased for a few yards of calico up-country, raises the price at the coast to ten or twenty pounds. In view of such facts as these, it would seem impossible for things to continue as they are. Mr. J. A. PEASE's impeachment of the home authorities is not a whit too strong when he says, "It is a humiliating position, and nothing less than a disgrace that the Government should pursue a policy of drift, and that there should be any break in the moral policy." There is every reason why both the Foreign and Colonial Offices should have pressed upon them the strong resolution adopted at the Mansion House last week, to the effect:—"That whereas it is computed that a quarter of a million of Slaves are at the present time engaged in working upon plantations, or as porters, etc., in the islands of Zanzibar and Pemba, having first been enslaved in Central Africa under circumstances of the greatest barbarity—and nearly all of them taken to Zanzibar and Pemba illegally, in contravention of the SULTAN's Decree of 1873, abolishing the Slave-trade—this meeting would emphatically urge Her Majesty's Government to abolish the status of Slavery in Zanzibar and Pemba without further delay, inasmuch as the continuance of a state of Slavery necessarily leads to a corresponding activity in the Slave-trade."—*Christian Leader*, October 24, 1895.

THE apathy that exists with regard to prevailing Slavery in Africa is very startling. "There were Slaves once; they are now freemen, thanks to the wonderful work of WILBERFORCE and other emancipators"—is an opinion that is tacitly held by hundreds and thousands of Englishmen. Yet the "wonderful work" is still incomplete. We pride ourselves on a noble example, and go no further. At the meeting of the

BRITISH AND FOREIGN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY, held on Monday, some significant facts were put in clear terms by Mr. DONALD MACKENZIE, who has just returned after investigating the condition of the Slave population in the islands of Zanzibar and Pemba. There are about 90,000 Slaves in Pemba, entirely at the mercy of their masters, who have powers of life and death. In a tumble-down old prison he found a number of prisoners, male and female, heavily manacled—Slaves who had attempted unsuccessfully to escape. Not more than five or six per cent. of Slave dhows are captured by Her Majesty's warships. The SULTAN OF ZANZIBAR possesses 30,000 Slaves. These statements were ably seconded by convincing proof, and we heartily echo Mr. MACKENZIE's hope that the Government will, without further delay, remove this disgrace to our glorious flag, which has been for ages the sign of liberty, freedom, and justice.—*The News*, October 18, 1895.

LORD SALISBURY has a most serious question to deal with in Zanzibar. It is not his fault that it is so. For, unhappily, his Liberal predecessors in power shut their eyes to the Slave system which, to the utter disgrace of the British name, flourishes in Zanzibar and Pemba, two territories for the right administration of which England is as responsible as she is for the right administration of India. The British public will presently wake up to the humiliating fact that Slavery—the buying and selling of Slaves, the punishment of them for attempts at flight, the flogging of them by their owners—is just now as rampant under the very nose of the British Consul-General at Zanzibar as it was in the British West Indies before the abolition, or in the South American States before the War of Secession. Mr. MACKENZIE, the well-known authority on East African affairs, has been exposing this villainous system. In any case, there will be hot discussions on the subject in Parliament next session. The system will certainly be doomed the moment the public are made aware of the facts. But, meanwhile, the question naturally and irresistibly forces itself upon one—Cannot the Cabinet, without waiting for Parliamentary support, make short work of a system which is to all intents and purposes a violation of the Constitution? Once on British soil every Slave is free—that is the principle. A British Consul's office, the deck of a British man-of-war, are "British soil." But in Zanzibar and Pemba, both in the British Dominions, there are a hundred and forty thousand Slaves, and of these all but about five per cent. are captives, the five per cent. having been born in the state of Slavery. The ninety-five per cent. have been hunted and caught by the Arab merchants and their agents. These captured Slaves in Zanzibar and Pemba are British subjects. Yet they are sold from one planter to another. They are imprisoned and savagely treated if they attempt to run away—the prisons, be it remembered, being British prisons. Here is the irony of the situation—on that very coast British gunboats are employed in watching Arab Slave vessels; but the Slavery which the English men-of-war are putting down on the high seas, flourishes under the British flag on dry land. The explanation and excuse offered by the Zanzibar officials is that this system of Slavery is necessary to local commerce and industries. It is the most hideous scandal suffered to exist at the present time in the British dominions.—*The Echo*, October 22, 1895.

An American view of the meeting of the BRITISH AND FOREIGN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY at the Mansion House.

The *Union Advertiser*, Rochester, New York State, under date October 23rd, in an editorial, thus comments upon the meeting :—

"SLAVERY UNDER THE BRITISH FLAG."

It seems little less than incredible that in the closing years of the nineteenth century, the greatest and most progressive nation of Europe should sanction human Slavery upon a vast extent of territory that is under her flag. In Zanzibar and Pemba, in South Africa, where the British are carrying forward the work of developing resources of vast value, more than a quarter of a million of black men from the interior of Africa are held in bondage, and are wearing out their lives in unrequited toil under masters who have no more right to compel such service than they have to make bondsmen of their European neighbours. Agitation in favour of the liberation of these Slaves has lately been commenced in England, but the public sentiment behind the movement is apparently feeble. The London *Daily News* admits that South African Slavery is a national disgrace, and adds this significant statement :— "So much of the raw material is wasted every year in the passage from the interior, that the 260,000 effective Slaves in Zanzibar and Pemba are said to represent an actual sacrifice of over a million lives. Something has to be done, and while we are about it it had better be the right thing."

The "raw material" referred to so flippantly is nothing more nor less than human flesh and blood. An annual sacrifice of over a million lives in supplying the British operators in Africa with Slaves from the interior is not enough to keenly touch the conscience of the slow British moralist and humanitarian ; though it is enough to have occasioned the calling of a public meeting or two in London, and possibly the time is not far distant when the voice of the people will be raised against the barbarities of the South African Slave system. But the moral sense of Great Britain has been so deeply shocked by lynchings in certain sections of the United States, against which loud protests have been raised in England of late, that there has been no room for compassion in behalf of Slaves under the British flag in South Africa, nor for indignation against the tyrants who profit by the labours of these wretched and helpless creatures. The United States have some problems to solve which concern the welfare of society, but as long as Great Britain is fostering such a gigantic traffic in human beings as that which is being carried on in South Africa, she will do well to let us alone and look to the protection of her own good name. And if she does not do this she will presently be forcibly reminded of her duty. The rest of the civilised world will not look upon her African Slave system without uttering a protest.

The Status of Zanzibar Slavery and Some Consequences. (REV. HORACE WALLER.)

To the Editor of the "TIMES."

SIR,—The double difficulty which the ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY has to deal with is to try and impress sufficiently upon the minds of people that they must scrutinise this Zanzibar matter from two distinct points of view.

In Zanzibar and Pemba Islands the Slaves are massed together. A puppet Arab Government is kept up by us for convenience sake in order that we may shift the

blame of Slavery on to traditional Arab customs ; at the same time, the British flag flies on and around the islands. Draw into the field of observation upon this standpoint a British fleet cruising round the islands to prevent the farther importation of Slaves, and an uneasy feeling here in England, pretty evenly testified to by Mr. CHAMBERLAIN and others in the House of Commons, and responded to by the Press throughout the country, and you have the situation face to face.

Now move away to the second point of view. Here we are in Central Africa, and in the districts whence the Slaves are drawn and eventually smuggled into Zanzibar, by hook or by crook. It is another protectorate. Here it is shown to those who doubt whether Africans will work without they are compelled to that they do so if they are free, and fairly dealt with. For instance, a letter lies before me, recently written from Nyasaland, in which a Scots colonist states that he is shipping sixty tons of coffee to this country, all cultivated by free labour and for wages put into the hands of the natives.

Our energetic action in sweeping out Slave-traders and affording safety to labourers lies at the root of this success. But the operation is not yet complete. Our most energetic Commissioner, Mr. H. H. JOHNSTON, is probably at this very time engaged in pitched battles with ZARAFI, a powerful Yao Slave-trading chief, who is in one corner of our Protectorate, and who harbours others with whom Acting-Commissioner SHARPE was recently actively engaged. For these purposes Mr. JOHNSTON has imported some 200 Sikh soldiers, and has enlisted mercenaries in Portuguese territory.

Now, all this costs money—a great deal of money—and lives. Great Britain has to pay the major part, and the young colonists (with customs duties) and the natives (with hut taxes) make up the rest.

Briefly, the above is what we have got into focus upon the spot to which we have shifted.

What does it amount to? We are paying two heavy bills. The first is for an army of Sikhs and others in order to crush out in Central Africa an organisation which supplies Slaves. The second is the expense we have incurred on a fleet—on which, I believe, we lay out some £80,000 per annum. The occupation of this fleet is principally to prevent Slaves being run into the two African islands of Zanzibar and Pemba.

A child can see that so long as the demand exists in these islands, and as long as the Slaves once run in are by our permission held as such, the demand will keep up, and we must go on paying these two bills annually.

The ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY contends that if we put an end to Slavery in Zanzibar, our one Protectorate, we shall relieve the harassing disturbances, the kidnappings, and the fighting in the other, and that our taxpayers will be the better for it. It is not contended that Zanzibar is the sole market, but it is a market, and a very lucrative one.

One merely puts the matter on the lowest ground—that of expense—eliminating that nauseous word “philanthropy,” and saying nothing about consistency. That there are other considerations—the mainsprings of the Society’s action—goes without saying.

If the Society has any bone to pick with Mr. HARDINGE in his report, it is that he will not take his eye off Zanzibar for the moment (neither he nor any other Political Agent and Consul-General ever examined Pemba), with its clove plantations,

its Arabs and their ways, and the British Indian pawnbrokers and theirs, to look inland.

There is too little sympathy for those who are in the scenes of desolation inland, and too much for those under his eyes, who, having wittingly made infamous bargains, may lose what they staked if we put our foot down.

It is poor work to stick up for existing Slavery in one Protectorate when it means actually the state of things I refer to in the other.

I venture to call it administrative astigmatism, a want of symmetry of sight, and I will further ask you to grant me permission to show that this defect really lies at the bottom of the odd view we take of the status of Slavery in Zanzibar.

I am, Sir,

Your obedient servant,

HORACE WALLER.

EAST LISS, HANTS, Oct. 16.

Slavery under the British flag. (Mr. D. MACKENZIE.)

To the Editor of the "DAILY NEWS."

SIR,—One of the metropolitan journals has slightly spoken of the arguments and facts brought forward at the Mansion House, on Monday last, in favour of the abolition of the status of Slavery in Zanzibar, Pemba and East Africa, as "loose philanthropy," and defended in powerful language Mr. HARDINGE's report, as contained in "Africa No. 6, 1895," on the other side of the question, without taking the slightest notice of a letter written to *The Times* by Bishop TUCKER, and published in its issue of August 3rd last. The Bishop, from his long experience on the coast and in the interior of Africa, points out, in unmistakable language, that there is no difficulty in obtaining willing labour from Slaves who had been set free, if fairly paid, and this is amply confirmed by the accompanying extract from a letter received by me when in Pemba last March. Mr. HARDINGE's report is, on the face of it, an exposition and endorsement of Sir LLOYD MATHEWS' views on the abolition question. As everyone knows, Sir LLOYD MATHEWS is the SULTAN OF ZANZIBAR's Prime Minister, and he, naturally, takes the part of the Arabs in this matter, in fact he does not disguise it. Mr. HARDINGE's report, on his own showing, is not, I regret to say, derived from his own personal experience, neither does it appear to be derived from independent sources, nor from persons competent to give an unbiassed opinion. This is amply proved by the following extract from a letter written to me while at Pemba, by one of the principal merchants at Zanzibar: "Mr. HARDINGE was chatting with me the other evening on the abolition question, and in the course of our conversation told me that he had sent home a despatch condemning it, thinking that it would result in a great disaster to Zanzibar. One of his ideas is that the freed Slaves would not work, but, so far as town labour is concerned, I told him that my experience as a merchant employing a considerable amount of labour was quite the reverse, for I find that freed Slaves are very regular labourers. This was totally different from his preconceived ideas (which he had gathered from people whose interests are totally

opposed to abolition), and he expressed considerable interest in what I told him, and regretted that our conversation had not occurred prior to the writing of his despatch."

Trusting to your well-known Anti-Slavery views for the insertion of the above,

I am, Sir,

Yours faithfully,

DONALD MACKENZIE,

Special Commissioner of the BRITISH AND FOREIGN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY to Zanzibar and Pemba.

LONDON INSTITUTION, FINSBURY CIRCUS, E.C., *October 17th.*

Correspondence. (RELATING TO MR. MACKENZIE'S REPORT.)

MOMBASA, 28th August, 1895.

THE SECRETARY,

BRITISH AND FOREIGN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,
London.

SIR,—I have to thank you for sending me a copy of Mr. DONALD MACKENZIE's interesting Report; but I am sorry to say his account of his conversation with me is not quite correct, and is very misleading.

To begin with, he says that I stated that "they (the I. B. E. A. Company) had freed a good many Slaves, but the result was unsatisfactory, as they would not work." What I really said was that, in one instance, at the Magarmi *shambas*, the Company released, *en masse*, about 120 Slaves, without any preparation or previous warning; the Slaves at once refused to do any work, although good wages were offered them; they looted the *shambas*, stealing the cocoa-nuts and other produce, and generally gave a great deal of trouble, until it became necessary to threaten to eject them if they did not settle down quietly. The Company during its 6½ years of existence, freed some 3,200 Slaves on the coast alone; but my remarks applied only to those at Magarmi above referred to, and this instance I quoted as an example of what would probably happen if the 140,000 Slaves on the coast were suddenly given their freedom.

Secondly, Mr. MACKENZIE says "He is opposed to the abolition of Slavery"; if he had inserted and emphasized the word "sudden" before abolition he would have been correct.

No one would be more pleased to see Slavery put an end to than I; but seven years' experience on the coast has shown me that any sudden steps for its abolition would be most harmful for the Slaves themselves, their masters, and the public generally.

As you have attributed these sentiments to me in your Report, I shall be much obliged if you will give equal publicity to this correction.

I have the honour to be, Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

J. P. D. PIGOTT.

TO THE SECRETARY OF THE

BRITISH AND FOREIGN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

SIR,—I have had placed before me Mr. PIGOTT's letter of the 20th August last addressed to your Society, which refers to my interview with that gentleman on the Slave question. I have given in my Report a faithful, and, in my opinion, a correct version of the general impression which Mr. PIGOTT's views on Slavery made on my mind at the time. It is true that he favoured me with certain particulars of the liberation of 120 Slaves on the *shamba* to which he refers, but that was simply given as a proof, according to his idea, of the African's unfitness for freedom, and this was the only instance to which Mr. PIGOTT referred. I had neither the time, nor the opportunity, for investigating the reasons which led to the unsatisfactory results attending the liberation of the Slaves above referred to. It struck me, however, that a proposal may have been made to the Slaves that they should repay their freedom by labour: this they would naturally oppose; or the wages offered might have been too small; the whole case seemed strange to me in the face of Captain ROGERS' report of the satisfactory results of the freeing of 1,000 Slaves within his Province of Witu, near to Mombasa, on the same coast.

The European Authorities on the East Coast of Africa have adopted a scheme of Ransom, by which certain Slaves are permitted to work out their own freedom—a system, in my judgment, particularly unsatisfactory, as it promotes the Slave-trade which it professes to abolish. I am aware that the I. B. E. A. Company was compelled, on political grounds, either to compensate the Arabs for some 3,000 runaway Slaves or undertake hostilities. The whole matter was, I understand, arranged through the good offices of Sir LLOYD MATHEWS. Neither Mr. PIGOTT, nor any one else, favoured me with any satisfactory particulars as to what became of them.

Mr. PIGOTT did, I believe, refer to an indefinite proposal for the gradual abolition of Slavery, and it was far from my intention to wound his feelings in any way or to misrepresent him. I do not see that he is even now in favour of the abolition of Slavery, except on impracticable lines. The gradual abolition of Slavery in East Africa is a scheme so complicated and unsatisfactory that it could not, in my judgment, ever lead to such an end. The Treaties and Decrees already made provided for gradual abolition, but Slavery continues as if no such documents existed.

In my opinion there are only two practical courses open to us:—

First, to acknowledge the status of Slavery, with all its train of horrors; or, Secondly, to abolish the whole institution at one blow.

I am, Sir, yours faithfully,

DONALD MACKENZIE.

A Pro-Slavery Argument.

THE *Pall Mall Gazette* stands alone amongst the Press organs of England, in devoting three elaborate articles from the pen of a foreign writer to an attack upon the BRITISH AND FOREIGN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY, and to a defence of domestic Slavery, as practised by Mohammedans in Africa. It is so curious an episode in the history of the movement for the abolition of Slavery so long carried on by Great Britain, and some European nations, that we have reprinted below the greater portion of these articles, placing our comments in parallel columns, together with two or three letters to the Editor of the *Pall Mall Gazette*, which were printed in his journal.

THE ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY AND THE ARABS.—I.

(BY OUR SPECIAL AFRICAN CORRESPONDENT.)

"PALL MALL GAZETTE."—October 19th,
1895.

COMMENTS BY EDITOR OF "ANTI-SLAVERY
REPORTER," ET CÆTERA.

ONCE more the ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY has held a meeting; once more statements have been made calculated to impress the British public ignorant of African life, and easily imposed upon whenever it is asked to contribute towards redressing sometimes real, often imaginary wrongs. The worst—and what is to be the most deplored in this case—is that these men who appeal to our sympathy and to our purse are thoroughly honest and in earnest.¹ If they could only be persuaded that their well-meant efforts to remedy what they fancy to be an appalling state of affairs are entirely wasted, if they could be convinced that they are impugning what really is one of the least wrongs the African natives are labouring under, I am certain that they would at once acknowledge their mistake and turn their efforts towards the proper direction.² Unfortunately, they only listen to one side of the question, losing sight of the others, and few people can or dare show them where they are wrong. At the last meeting at the Mansion House the chairman stated that half a million lives were sacrificed in the African Slave-trade, while two million persons were torn from their homes. These figures are entirely fanciful, utterly unsupported by proofs of any

¹ *Certainly we are in earnest; but we look at the question from a British, and not from a French point of view.*

² *There is only one side to Slavery and the Slave-trade—"It is the sum of all human villainies."*

kind, and I defy Mr. PEASE to prove his statement.³ The contention of the Anti-Slavery Societies has always been that the Arabs are at the bottom of this traffic: they tell us that most of the Slaves captured in the interior are brought to Zanzibar or Pemba. The caravan routes are not many—four great routes at the most—leading from the interior to the coast.⁴ Along these are nowadays numerous European posts, and no great caravan can escape detection. For many reasons caravans are bound to follow these trade routes, the chief one being that they pass through the most densely populated districts, and these have to be crossed in order to find food. It must also be remembered that caravans purely composed of Slaves scarcely exist at the present time; in fact, the Arab going thousands of miles inland to raid a district in order to capture Slaves is a very pretty romance, but has rarely been true.⁵

IVORY v. SLAVES.

The Arab is chiefly an ivory merchant. Look at the enormous caravans that start constantly from the coast towards the interior with five and six hundred bales of calico.⁶ These are meant to purchase ivory, and when an Arab trader, after three or four years' travelling, returns to the coast it is always with a large quantity of ivory;⁷ and Slaves are but an adjunct to his caravan—a most dangerous one now, as detection means the confiscation of the whole of his ivory; and Slaves are not such a valuable merchandise compared to the latter. A Slave is worth from £3 to £6 at the coast, and supposing that forty Slaves should be brought along with sixty loads of ivory, this would mean £150, about, of Slaves, against £2,000 of ivory.⁸

I have said that the romance of Arabs going thousands of miles into the interior with the object of raiding a district in order to secure Slaves is a pure invention,

³ *These figures are those used by Dr. LIVINGSTONE and adopted by Cardinal LAVIGERIE and many others. Of course they are only estimates, for the Census officers do not yet accompany Slave caravans.*

⁴ *On whose authority is this statement made? There are countless routes; for, as General GORDON himself said to us, "If I block one route they always open another—often waterless, and causing more suffering to the wretched Slaves."*

⁵ *A singularly wild statement in the face of the many facts that have been published, by eye-witnesses who do not write anonymously.*

⁶ *Who carry these bales?—Slaves, most certainly.*

⁷ *Who carry the ivory?—Slaves.*

⁸ *How could forty Slaves carry sixty loads? If the forty here described were not carriers, then the sixty loads had sixty more Slaves. Such inaccuracies are very plentiful in these articles.*

and I will now give reasons for it.⁹ The Arabs, being especially anxious to secure ivory, can only do so by being friendly with the natives, as the latter bury or hide whatever ivory they possess, and only produce it in small quantities at a time, when they have gained full confidence in those who come to purchase it. There is another reason why Arabs should avoid war. After the smallest show of hostility from a caravan, natives for fifty miles round clear away, and not only does business come to a standstill, but also, when the natives have cleared, the caravan can no longer obtain food, and is often compelled to turn back. In fact, the Arabs have so well understood that it is necessary to gain the confidence of the natives to trade with them that they have established large trading centres in the interior, such as Tabora, Ujiji, Nyangwe, and so on. Superior in intelligence to the natives among whom they have settled, and better armed, they have soon from traders become the acknowledged rulers of the country; in fact, they have merely done fifty years before us what we Europeans have been doing for the last ten years. The only difference is that we held a Congress and divided Africa between ourselves before having conquered it, while the Arabs settled there first and established their rule afterwards.¹⁰ Of course they have had to make war in many instances against chiefs who would not submit to their rule, against others who attacked their caravans, and, again, against others who attacked the natives under their protection. These wars, of course, were conducted under a less civilised principle than ours, the chief difference being that the women and children taken prisoners were kept as Slaves, although I know cases where European officers have, after a fight, given to their native soldiers, as wives, the female prisoners.¹¹

• • • • •

⁹ *The writer evidently has not read the accounts of Slave-raids given by almost every African traveller of note. He seems to speak from his own experience only, which is evidently but limited.*

¹⁰ *Indeed! The difference seems to us very considerable. What the Society urges is that all the Powers—including Great Britain—should abolish the status of Slavery in all parts of Africa under their rule.*

¹¹ *“European officers”—not English—which is possibly true.*

MR. MACKENZIE'S CHARGES.

I shall now come to the chief business of the last meeting of the ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY, the report of Mr. DONALD MACKENZIE. It must be remarked that once more, in this case, according to the universal practice of the Anti-Slavery Societies, facts are carefully avoided, and we are asked to believe general sweeping statements utterly unsupported by serious evidence. I have met Mr. MACKENZIE. I found him a most pleasant man, but knowing as little of Africa as I do of the Antarctic regions.¹² He spent a couple of months in Africa visiting Zanzibar, then crossing over to Dar-es-Salam and landing at Pemba Island. He then came back home under the impression that he knew all about Africa. His report deals with two distinct subjects: first, the horrors supposed to be daily committed by European leaders of caravans; second, domestic Slavery. According to him, Government and private caravans are composed of Slaves hired from their masters. "Armed expeditions pouring into the interior under the command of Europeans who, in many cases, kill, plunder, and burn the villages of the natives, almost rivalling in horror and destruction the Arab raids in quest of Slaves."

I should like Mr. MACKENZIE to quote the names of the Europeans who have been guilty of such conduct.¹³ I should like him to specify when and where such outrages have taken place. It must be noticed that he pretends that they have been perpetrated in British territory, as he adds that "these scandals have come to the ears of the Zanzibar Government." There can, therefore, be but one place where this may have happened—viz., on the road between Mombasa and Uganda. If Mr. MACKENZIE's tone were to be adopted, his wholesale accusations could only be defined as infamous lies. I do not mean by that that he has wilfully told an untruth, I merely affirm that he has

¹² Mr. MACKENZIE *remembers meeting the "Special African Correspondent" of the P. M. G. in Aden, and he remembers also what was the object with which he visited Aden. He also saw him in a store in Zanzibar. His description of Mr. MACKENZIE'S knowledge of Africa is too childish. Mr. M.'s knowledge of that Continent extends over some twenty years of active life, during which he founded the colony of Cape Jubu.*

All travellers admit that caravans are composed mostly of Slaves. Mr. H. M. STANLEY took a large number when he went in search of EMIN, and he did not deny that the small band of survivors who returned from that terrible journey had to give over a large portion of their hard-earned wages to their masters, who remained safe all the time in Zanzibar.

¹³ Mr. MACKENZIE *has the names of leaders of caravans who have lost very large numbers of their men, but he will not publish them to satisfy the curiosity of unofficial newspaper writers. They may possibly be disclosed some day.*

On the contrary this statement can be verified officially, and in reply we insert a letter from Mr. DONALD MACKENZIE respecting his so-called "infamous lies."

To the Editor of the PALL MALL GAZETTE.

SIR,—I do not think that any Englishman would be bold enough to write articles in your paper in defence of Slavery, especially as we are at the close

credited and repeated statements that are utterly untrue, and I shall prove it. Out of the numerous caravans that have crossed this part of British territory since the Imperial British East Africa Company took possession of it, a single one attacked and destroyed some native villages in Kavirondo, and it is only fair to add that the natives of this district are a bad lot: they attacked Mr. JACKSON when he previously crossed their country, and have recently killed a British trader. But, even so, the caravan leader who was guilty of the destruction of some of their villages only escaped arrest by hurried flight from Africa, Sir GERALD PORTAL having sent orders for his apprehension.

This, I repeat, is the only instance of high-handed proceedings taken by a caravan leader, and there was no plunder, no wholesale killing of natives, as described by Mr. MACKENZIE. In fact, it was from me that he heard this story, as he was present when I mentioned the case to Count TELEKI at Aden. I know but one other instance of shameful ill-treatment of natives by a European, and the European who was guilty of it is a missionary and an advocate of the Anti-Slavery movement.

Before dismissing this first part of Mr. MACKENZIE's report, I must also protest against the fallacious statement that caravans recruited by Government and private travellers consist of Slaves hired from their masters. This is a fresh proof of the utter ignorance of African life exhibited by the ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY'S Commissioner. Undoubtedly most of the porters are Slaves, but their masters have nothing to do with their enlistment, neither do they benefit by the money earned by their Slaves. I will return to this in a second article; but I want first to call attention to another of Mr. MACKENZIE's grave accusations against Europeans in charge of caravans. According to him, sick porters are abandoned

of the nineteenth century. I think I remember meeting your correspondent, who withholds his name and his nationality, but my report was not made up from any information which I gathered from him. I believe my experience of Africa extends over a much longer period than that of your correspondent, and I am perfectly well acquainted with Mohammedan Slavery in various parts of the African continent.

My report, as is usual with such documents, was made up from personal investigations, and on the opinions of gentlemen, officials and others, who are more competent to give an opinion on this question than a mere traveller, as I believe your correspondent to be.

With regard to the Slave-porters, your correspondent seems hardly to be aware that their treatment became so scandalous that the Zanzibar Government were obliged to issue Regulations, which in themselves are not very humane, and, therefore, I would refer him to the Zanzibar Government for further information on this head.

Your correspondent does not produce any evidence in support of his statements; they simply rest upon his own words. I am quite able to disclose the names of those who are accused of ill-treating porters, both English and foreign, when the proper time arrives.

Your correspondent disputes my estimate of the number of Slaves held directly or indirectly by the SULTAN; but he does not supply any estimate of his own on the subject.

Your correspondent apparently tries to make us believe that the Arabs are generous enough to allow their Slaves to be used as porters for long caravan journeys without any pecuniary return, which is preposterous on the face of it, as it is a well-known fact that at least one-half of

to die on the road, and a large percentage perish in this way. Here, again, I should like him to quote facts, and names of leaders who have behaved in the way he describes. Most likely he is ignorant of the fact that before the Government took over the Imperial British East Africa Company's territory, so great was the number of sick men that were taken to and left to recruit at the stations of the interior that caravan leaders had to give the names and full particulars of the men so left at the stations, and to undertake to pay the expenses connected with their treatment and their keep; and I can further affirm that whenever a man is missing when camp is reached a party is sent back to look for him. The occurrence is, besides, a very rare one, as porters are not usually taken in large numbers, and the loss of loads does not often happen.—*Pall Mall Gazette*, October 19, 1895.

Note to Pages 186-187.

The letter from Mr. J. P. D. PIGOTT, of Mombasa, to Mr. C. H. ALLEN, was forwarded through his brother, Mr. DIGBY PIGOTT, of Her Majesty's Stationery Office, with the request that it might be inserted in the next issue of the "Anti-Slavery Reporter." This has been done, together with a reply from the Special Commissioner, whose Report is complained of. Mr. ALLEN had nothing to do with the compilation of the Report, which was taken from notes made by Mr. MACKENZIE on the same day, neither did Mr. ALLEN "attribute these sentiments" to Mr. PIGOTT, as stated in his letter.

the wages of the porters goes to the masters.

I am, Sir, yours faithfully,

DONALD MACKENZIE,
The Special Commissioner of the BRITISH
AND FOREIGN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.
THE LONDON INSTITUTION, E.C., Oct. 21.

LETTER FROM SECRETARY OF
ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

To the Editor of the PALL MALL GAZETTE.

SIR,—Your "Special African Correspondent" in to-day's *Pall Mall Gazette* gives so roseate a description of Slavery, Slave-raiding, and other African horrors, that one begins to wonder whether, like Rip van Winkle, we have all been asleep, and are now waking up to find that all these things are but "a very pretty romance," as he euphemistically expresses it. There must indeed be a change if it be true, as your correspondent avers, that "under cover of repression of Slavery the agents of the Anti-Slavery Societies have caused a much larger loss of life than the so-called (*sic*) Slave-raiders have ever done in the same space of time." He does not say what space of time, but some thirty years ago Slave-raiders were very properly "so-called" by DAVID LIVINGSTONE.

He it was who estimated the annual loss of life in Africa from the Slave trade at half a million, so that Mr. ARTHUR PEASE had good authority when he gave that estimate to the meeting on Monday. As regards the butcheries which your correspondent states are committed by the agents of the BRITISH AND FOREIGN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY in Africa—as he evidently includes us among the societies he accuses—I should like to be allowed to inform him that this Society has not, and never had, a single agent in Africa, and that it has never caused the loss of a human life in that vast blood-stained continent. It has a hundred times stated, in public and in the press, that it disapproves

EDITORIAL of the *Pall Mall Gazette*, October 23rd, 1895, in reply to Mr. ALLEN's letter.

We publish elsewhere a letter from the Secretary of the BRITISH AND FOREIGN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY criticising an article by our special African correspondent. As to the facts at issue—if there are any, which is not very clear—our correspondent will probably have something to say. In the meantime let us call attention to a very characteristic feature of this letter. A parcel of well-meaning philanthropists meet together, form a society, and pay a secretary, whose duty it is to write letters and keep up agitations. It is not necessary that he should know more about his subject than he can extract from Blue Books and journals. Here, for instance, is Mr. CHARLES H. ALLEN, who, as we infer from his letter, has never been in Africa at all. He boasts that his Society "has not and never had a single agent in Africa."¹⁴ It is of that we complain. It is a pity that societies which sit at home at ease do not send out agents to examine the facts for themselves. The Committee at New Broad Street feel quite competent to pass judgment on the acts and opinions of men who, quite as humane as themselves, happen to have personal experience of the questions with which they deal. And "the old gentleman," as Mr. ALLEN calls JOHN BULL, allows himself to be deluded by them.

° ° ° °

SECOND ARTICLE BY SPECIAL AFRICAN CORRESPONDENT OF P. M. G.

Mr. MACKENZIE tells us that "the SULTAN OF ZANZIBAR is opposed to the abolition of Slavery, because he is the largest Slave-holder in Zanzibar; he is

of the use of force in suppressing the Slave trade, and relies only upon the abolition of Slavery itself as the sole means to that end, since wherever there is a demand there will certainly be a supply—as JOHN BULL is now finding, to his great discomfort, in his dependencies of Zanzibar and Pemba. But possibly, after all, your correspondent has only written this article to see how much the old gentleman will stand before he once more rouses himself to say, "Slaves cannot breathe in England," including therein British protectorates, such as Zanzibar and Pemba.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,
CHAS. H. ALLEN,

Secretary, BRITISH AND FOREIGN
ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

55, NEW BROAD STREET,

Oct. 19.

¹⁴ Mr. ALLEN declined to answer this ridiculous and personal attack. Educated Englishmen know something of the foundation and constitution of the BRITISH AND FOREIGN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY, and of the great historic names of its founders. It does not much matter whether Mr. ALLEN has been in Africa or not, but those conversant with the work of the Society are aware that his frequent visits to Morocco and other parts were not without some Anti-Slavery results. By "agents" in Africa, we mean leaders of armed expeditions such as are sent out by France, Belgium, and Germany. Although called "Anti-Slavery," they are really under their respective Governments.

The BRITISH AND FOREIGN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY has often suffered from being classed by superficial Press writers amongst these fighting expeitions.

This attack upon the BRITISH AND FOREIGN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY would probably not have been made had the "Special African Correspondent of the *Pall Mall Gazette*" referred to the article written by him, in his own name, to that journal on July 27, 1894. He then very properly complained that "if the Anti-Slavery Societies had used their extensive funds in making roads, in establishing trading stations,

said to possess 30,000 Slaves, and if they were set free he would no longer receive an income from them." I have no patience with such misrepresentations. What income does the SULTAN derive from his Slaves? Mr. MACKENZIE does not explain it, for the very good reason that he cannot do so. A very small calculation will show that they are not so profitable as we are asked to believe. Let us put down the cost of feeding each one of these Slaves at Rs. 3 per month (a very small figure for Zanzibar). Let us even put the total cost of maintenance of each Slave as low as Rs. 30 per annum, this gives us a total of Rs. 900,000 (=£45,750) for the maintenance of the 30,000 the SULTAN is said to own. Out of these at least 10 per cent. are unable to work, either through old age, or else through sickness; therefore a yearly sum of £4,575 is spent every year on keeping these useless Slaves. If we now calculate the original cost of these Slaves, their average value being Rs. 100, we come to the respectable figure of Rs. 3,000,000, or £152,000. The average working life of a Slave, between the time he is able to perform profitable work and the time when he either dies or is unable to work any longer, being about twenty-five years, we can, without exaggeration, put down the interest on the capital invested at 15 per cent.—a very small sum considering that a native banker expects a good deal more on the best security; this gives us a yearly amount of £22,875 for interest on the money invested in Slaves. As the SULTAN'S private income does not exceed £6,000 a year, his Slaves do not, after all, appear to be a very profitable investment.

To resume. The abolition of domestic Slavery among the Arabs would have the same effect as the passing of a law among us by which the use of paid servants would be prohibited, gentlemen and lady helpers being only allowed, these to be treated on the same footing as ourselves,

etc., "they would have done better than by waging war against the Arabs. In commendation of this view, and in explanation that the BRITISH AND FOREIGN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY did not approve of the warlike action of some foreign Societies, Mr. CHARLES H. ALLEN wrote the following letter, which appeared in the "Pall Mall Gazette" of July 31, 1894, and is particularly applicable at the present moment:—

To the Editor of the "PALL MALL GAZETTE."

*"The interesting article on Africa, by ***** in the 'Pall Mall Gazette' of July 27th, contains his views upon the action of the Anti-Slavery Societies on that continent. * * * protests against those societies 'trying to suppress Slavery by force,' for he thinks that if the societies, 'instead of waging war,' had used their extensive funds in making roads, etc., 'a formidable and peaceful blow would have been dealt to Slavery.'*

"Will you allow me to inform the readers of the 'Pall Mall Gazette' that the BRITISH AND FOREIGN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY, which Cardinal LAVIGERIE designated as the doyenne Society of the world, and which I have the honour to represent, must not be confounded with the societies whose warlike action he so justly deprecates. This Society has never advocated the employment of force in the suppression of Slavery or the Slave-trade, although from ignorance it has often suffered loss by being mixed up with the Foreign Anti-Slavery Societies in the minds of many estimable persons in England. We have no extensive funds for making roads, etc., nor have we any paid representative in Africa, armed or unarmed, though we are glad to say many private individuals are corresponding members of our office, and often give us valuable information.

"The action of our Society is of a moral, religious, and pacific nature only, and we strongly support the opening up of Africa by roads, and especially of railroads, as recommended by the Brussels Conference.

"CHARLES H. ALLEN."

July 31st, 1894.

and to have the right of leaving at a minute's notice.¹⁵ That Mr. MACKENZIE has seen a few people in chains does not prove that this is a common practice. I pretend to know quite as much as he does on the subject, and I say that such means of punishment are very rarely resorted to; besides, this can be prevented without emancipating the Slaves. Altogether, there is no doubt that on the whole these Slaves are far better treated, far more happy, and far more devoted to their masters than most of our European servants or workmen. Among the masters there are bad ones, as in all communities, but I wish that there were as few people suffering from moral and physical anguish in our civilised Europe as there is among Zanzibar Slaves.

African natives are nothing but grown-up children, utterly heedless of the future, and as little fit to look after themselves and to enjoy unrestricted liberty as an English boy of twelve is competent to be the head of a family.¹⁶ What must be stopped is the traffic in Slaves, prevalent chiefly among the natives of the interior; this will soon die a natural death with the introduction of railways and the extension of trade, but it is not to be desired that domestic Slavery should be abolished; it is the only guarantee the native has that he will be looked after by his employer. Let it be gradually regulated, let the power of the master be gradually reduced; give afterwards to the Slave the right of redeeming himself if he wishes to do so and if his master consents, but do not give the master the right to turn his Slave adrift. In fact, it is our duty to protect the native against his worst enemy—himself.¹⁷—*Pall Mall Gazette*, October 23rd, 1895.

¹⁵ *Our domestic servants cannot be bought and sold, nor can they be flogged with hippopotamus-hide whips. It is curious that any newspaper published in London could print theories worthy only of the days of LEGREE and other advocates of domestic Slavery.*

The pen of HARRIET BEECHER STOWE, and the sword of ABRAHAM LINCOLN, killed Slavery in the United States, and we venture to say that no writer in any newspaper, however powerful, will be able to prolong its life in a British Protectorate for a single hour.

¹⁶ *The only way to stop the traffic in Slaves is to stop the markets into which they can be so profitably smuggled, in spite of Treaties, cruisers, and other safeguards, which look very well on paper.*

¹⁷ *It is OUR duty to protect him against the misleading statements of persons who travel through Africa for their own purposes, and then try to prove that Slavery is a blessing, and that "so-called Arab Slave-raids are a pretty romance"!*

THIRD *PALL MALL* ARTICLE.THE ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY AND
THE ARABS.

A REPLY.

(BY OUR SPECIAL AFRICAN CORRESPONDENT.)

I HAVE read most carefully Mr. CHARLES H. ALLEN's and Mr. D. MACKENZIE's letters in reply to my articles on this subject.¹⁸ Being out of town when the letters appeared, I could not reply to them sooner. Mr. ALLEN's letter is like all that gentleman's productions, a series of very high-sounding words that may ring well on a platform, but do not bear analysis; to refute facts big words are not required, but facts themselves. His letter only confirms what I said before—the anti-Slavery agitator's system is to make general sweeping statements, but the facts and evidence to support them never are forthcoming. The Holy Father is believed by many to be infallible, and Mr. CHARLES H. ALLEN wishes us to credit him with the same quality; but I shall not, like him, waste empty words, and I shall confine myself to facts, noting by the way that he has not replied to a single one of my statements. I make a mistake here, for he has told us how Mr. PEASE came to his estimate of half a million lives yearly lost through the Slave-trade. LIVINGSTONE is the authority quoted!¹⁹ This is as nonsensical as if a foreigner wrote that Scotchmen are barbarians in the habit of burning witches, and when challenged to prove his statement, replied that at the beginning of this century a witch was burned in this way in Scotland. In fact, this lame explanation brought forward by Mr. ALLEN illustrates better than I could ever have done his utter ignorance of African affairs. Since LIVINGSTONE's time thirty years have elapsed, and in that space Africa has undergone a more complete change than Great Britain since Queen Anne's

¹⁸ *We fail to see proof of the careful reading here alluded to. This page bristles with absurd assertions. The coupling together the names of "THE HOLY FATHER" and Mr. ALLEN is too childish.*

¹⁹ *Scotland has given up burning witches—but the Arab has not given up raiding Africa for Slaves, and he will continue to do this so long as France encourages the trade in Slaves by selling her flag to the owners of Slave dhows, and so long as Slaves are recognised as lawful chattels in Zanzibar, Pemba, or Madagascar, and the Comoro Islands. The question of "ignorance" is relative. We do not attempt to measure that of the P. M. G. correspondent.*

reign. And even since Mr. STANLEY's last and ever-memorable journey the whole of the condition of the country has been altogether altered. If Mr. CHARLES H. ALLEN had read my article carefully he would have seen that I explained how the great trade routes were now covered with European military stations. I can only refer him to what I said.²⁰ The Secretary of the ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY seems to resent very much what I said about what he calls the "butcheries committed by the agents of the BRITISH AND FOREIGN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY in Africa." I merely referred to the Anti-Slavery Societies in general, and to show Mr. ALLEN that I never make statements without being ready to support them by facts, I shall quote a few instances of the blessings brought on the natives under the cover of repression of Slavery. * * * [We omit these instances, as they are all about foreign expeditions, and do not bear upon the work of the BRITISH AND FOREIGN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.]

Mr. ALLEN, it is true, insists on the fact that the BRITISH AND FOREIGN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY never had a single agent in Africa.²¹ It is no wonder, therefore, that its members should know so little about a subject on which they pretend to be an infallible authority, and it is monstrous that such people should pretend to contradict and to condemn men who can claim a thorough knowledge of every side of the question, such as, for instance, that most able diplomatic agent, Mr. HARDINGE.²² If the Society wishes to call public attention to some real and disgraceful wrongs inflicted on the natives, let it send some trustworthy agents to the Portuguese sphere of influence in the neighbourhood of the Zambesi. As to Mr. ALLEN's last remark when he states that perhaps my article has been written to see how much the "old gentleman" (meaning the British public) "will stand before he once more rouses himself to say, 'Slaves cannot breathe in England,'"

²⁰ *The writer makes another "mistake here"—for he takes no notice of the statement that Mr. ALLEN made denying that his Society had ever sent any expedition into Africa, or that it had ever caused the death of a single human being. He persists in classing it with Foreign Anti-Slavery Societies, although he knows better.*

²¹ *An "agent" is the term used for the leader of an armed expedition. The BRITISH AND FOREIGN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY has none of these, but it has a number of qualified correspondents in Africa, who are honorary members of the Society, and from whom valuable and reliable information can be obtained. It also sends out Special Commissioners from time to time such as Mr. MACKENZIE, who met the writer of the P. M. G. articles in Aden, and knows the object of his visit to that British port.*

²² *We have not the slightest wish to depreciate Mr. HARDINGE's well-known ability and experience in diplomatic affairs, but we cannot admit that his experience of Slavery in Zanzibar has extended over any considerable time. Neither does he himself claim such experience in the Report which he transmitted to the Government in March of this year, when he had only been 13 months on the island. We gather from his own statements that he takes his facts and*

I can merely say, in reply, that Mr. ALLEN cannot ignore²³ who I am, and he ought to know that I have never been afraid to speak out my mind, and if he wishes to know exactly why my article has been written, I will give him the explanation in his own words: I wanted to see how much longer the British public will stand such an amount of false statements as those daily made by the ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY before it rouses himself (*sic*) to say, "Enough humbug; I am sick of it, and I now mean to keep my money."

I shall now come to Mr. MACKENZIE'S letter. His letter is sober and earnest, like the man himself, but I should scarcely call it a reply to my article: he refutes none of my arguments, and his indignation has probably prevented him from reading carefully what I wrote. He begins by stating that no Englishman would be bold enough to write such articles as mine. This is exactly what I said. As to my competence as a mere traveller, it may be worth very little in Mr. MACKENZIE'S eyes, but I shall ask him whether he has, like myself, lived for years among the natives themselves, talking with them in their own language, discussing matters from their own point of view, with the object of mastering their customs, habits, and religions. I did not travel for the sake of only seeing the country, but chiefly in order to study the natives, and the book I intend to publish shortly will show Mr. MACKENZIE whether I know them well or not. As to defending Slavery, I never did so; I contradicted the statements of the ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY, which is a very different thing. I tried to show that domestic Slavery could not in the actual state of affairs be abolished. It is very easy to destroy an existing system, but at the same time something must be proposed to replace it, or else anarchy follows. Whenever a caravan of Slaves is captured Government finds the greatest difficulty

forms his opinions from the information given him by General Sir LLOYD MATHEWS, who is the Sultan's Prime Minister, and is more or less interested in the continuance of the present state of affairs. Therefore, Mr. HARDINGE'S Report naturally leans towards the views held by General Sir LLOYD MATHEWS.

The authority on whom we would rather rely is that of Sir JOHN KIRK, who commenced residence in Zanzibar in January, 1866, after an experience of six years in the Zambesi district with Dr. LIVINGSTONE. Sir JOHN KIRK was made Consul-General in Zanzibar in 1873, and did not retire till 1887. His knowledge, therefore, exceeds that of all the recent Consuls-General put together.

In 1884, Sir JOHN KIRK sent a despatch to LORD GRANVILLE, in which he stated that the abolition of Slavery as a status known to the law was essential to the prosperity of Pemba. In October, 1895, Sir JOHN KIRK stated that he still held the same opinion.

²³ Mr. ALLEN is bound to "ignore" the name of the writer till he himself discloses it. His attacks are at present only those of an anonymous Press correspondent.

The writer's message to the British public that the BRITISH AND FOREIGN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY "daily makes false statements," and that the public had better keep its money, will not be taken seriously, coming as it evidently does from a strong Anglo-phobist.

in dealing with the freed Slaves, and has to send them to mission stations, where they have to serve the whites instead of the Arabs. Ask them which they like best—not in the presence of the missionaries, of course, but after making friends with them, and you will see how they appreciate the boon conferred on them. Being myself a very small authority as a traveller, I might refer Mr. MACKENZIE to a book written by a most distinguished official, Mr. H. H. JOHNSTON, C.B. Let Mr. MACKENZIE read the well-known Commissioner's opinion on the free natives brought up at the Mombasa mission in his book "Kilima-Njaro."

I am perfectly aware of the regulations issued by the Zanzibar Government with regard to the enlisting of porters, but I might point out that these regulations were issued in order to prevent the natives from leaving Zanzibar to go and serve in foreign territories, leaving no labour in the island.²⁴ For special reasons that Mr. MACKENZIE knows well, nobody is better aware of these regulations than myself. I never disputed Mr. MACKENZIE's estimated number of Slaves belonging to the SULTAN OF ZANZIBAR. I merely disputed his statement that the SULTAN derived large profits from them. As to his last statement that the masters get half the wages of their Slaves, this is far from the general rule, and when it happens it is a mere arrangement between Slave and master never enforced by law, and at the entire discretion of the Slave, who draws his wages himself.²⁵ Then does not the master house, clothe, and feed the Slave when he is out of work, or sick, or too old to toil? Does not the same master supply him with a wife or wives?²⁶ Has Mr. MACKENZIE ever seen in East Africa numbers of starving beggars as in London? Let the ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY suggest a plan by which the natives will be, like the domestic Slaves actually are, provided against sickness, old age, famine and lack of work; then

²⁴ *The P. M. G. Special appears to be a little mixed in what he says about enlisting porters. We will make him a present of the real facts of the case, and take our chance of his saying that they are mere "general sweeping statements," for we usually have official documents at our back. He says: "These Regulations were issued in order to prevent the natives from leaving Zanzibar to go and serve in foreign territories, leaving no labour in the island." Notice of the Decree of the SULTAN here alluded to was issued by the late Sir GERALD PORTAL, under date Zanzibar, 11th September, 1891, and a copy of the same was forwarded to us by the MARQUIS OF SALISBURY. Had this Decree been carried out, no porters could have been taken into the interior, nor would the subsequent Regulations for their protection have been required. These latter are the Regulations to which our Commissioner referred in his Report, and of which the P. M. G. Special does not appear to be cognisant. A copy of these was received by us from LORD KIMBERLEY in October last, and they were subsequently published in the Zanzibar Gazette and in our columns.*

²⁵ *This is against all evidence, as the writer ought to know.*

²⁶ *Where does the master get the wives? They must have been either bought, like cattle, or stolen, from their own families.*

will be the time to suppress domestic Slavery, and while they are at it they might apply the method to our poor little corner of the earth that wants it so badly. —*Pall Mall Gazette*, 26th October, 1895.

*To the Editor of the "PALL MALL
GAZETTE."*

SIR,—Permit me kindly to say a word or two upon your special African correspondent's arguments respecting the African Slave-trade, and the connection of the Arabs with the particular barbarism which it entails. It is a very important matter that confusion should be kept out of the public mind upon this matter, and especially at this time. Your correspondent admits (in your issue of the 26th) that he is not a British subject, and there is enough in his various articles to make it quite clear that he does not claim nationality with Germany or Belgium. One does not say this offensively, but, on the contrary, from the defensive point of view; because it so happens that the greater part of the evidence which is forthcoming against the Arabs and their Slave-trade has been collected by our own officers, travellers, and missionaries. Looking at their testimony carefully one notices a singular accord throughout. Nor is there anything to assure success to the bold venture which is made by Mr. ALLEN's antagonist when he tries to put every witness out of court who is not up to his own date. It is the more probable that little change has taken place in the miserable state of the natives, first under the Arab, and later under the Congo Government rule; if there be any, it is sadly for the worse.

However, more than twenty years have elapsed since LIVINGSTONE described the Arab massacres of the Nyangwé natives. Let us pick out one or two bits of evidence which have been placed on a bulky record

We subjoin an important letter from the Rev. HORACE WALLER, together with a portion of the reply of the Special Correspondent of the P. M. G.

in the interval. In the year 1888, some of the same Nyangwé horde were at work on the natives at the north end of Lake Nyassa. Captain LUGARD, D.S.O., C.B., relates as follows:—

"The Arabs drove an enormous crowd of Wankondé natives into a half-dried lagoon. Its shallow waters swarmed with crocodiles. The wretched Wankondé were treacherously attacked, and volley after volley was fired into the dense crowds of men, women, and children who had fled to conceal themselves in the reeds. To these the Slavers set fire, and gave the wretched people the option of rushing into the bay to be devoured by the crocodiles, or of being roasted alive, or of coming out to be shot down wholesale, or captured and enslaved, while their assailants climbed the trees to watch the butchery and fire with more advantage on the terrified masses among the reeds." (See "Rise of our African Empire," vol. i., p. 54.)

Mr. MONTEITH FOTHERINGHAM, in his "Adventures in Nyassaland" (p. 81), gives a more lengthy description of the scene. And here, by the bye, Sir, I must carry this wordy war between the ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY and your correspondent "into the enemy's country."

I fancy he knew Mr. FOTHERINGHAM, whose recent death all deplore. It is a matter of history that our British Commissioner, Mr. H. H. JOHNSTON, arrived upon the spot when Captain LUGARD, Mr. FOTHERINGHAM, and others were taking the part of the natives and fighting the Arabs. The Commissioner at that time took the same view of the Arabs which now seems to be held by your special

correspondent. At all events, he put a stop to the campaign, received peaceful assurances from the Arabs, and hoped for better things.

Now let us pass on to 1894. Your correspondent quotes Mr. H. H. JOHNSTON, C.B., in his communication of the 26th, as "a most distinguished official," and perhaps he could hardly call up a more powerful witness. He, for his part, has meanwhile put his predilections for the Arabs to the test, and says thus of them in his report to the Foreign Office ("Africa," No. 6, 1894, p. 30):—

"I have now come to this conclusion after five years' experience in this part of Africa (Nyassaland), that the presence of Arabs is incompatible with the introduction of European civilisation, and sooner or later the Arabs must go from Central Africa. . . . In the interior of Africa they are adventurers, and ordinarily adventurers of the worst type."

Again—

"The Arabs and Wanyamwezi do a great deal of harm in the north, and it may certainly be said with truth that the Arabs are the backbone of the Slave-trade. If the Arabs were entirely expelled from Central Africa, the Wanyamwezi and other native races would soon be reduced to a condition of law and order" (p. 25).

And, last of all, let me refer to a most generous and beautiful obituary notice

written by Commissioner H. H. JOHNSTON with reference to Mr. FOTHERINGHAM'S decease. It bears date, Zomba, August 1, 1895. Speaking of himself and the line he once took, as shown above, he says :—

"When the writer of these lines came out to Lake Nyassa in 1889, to find, if possible, a peaceful solution of the Arab difficulty, he met with a loyal and whole-hearted assistance from Mr. FOTHERINGHAM, though the latter held views which time has shown to be the true ones, for he believed it to be easier for the leopard to change his spots than for the Arab to renounce Slave-trading, and apply himself to peaceful and honest pursuits." (*Cent. Afr. Brit. Gazette*, Vol. II., No. 11, p. 1.)

So, as your "Special African Correspondent" will only have your readers listen to the most up-to-date facts, combined with long knowledge of Arab ways, I offer him the witness, of all others, whom he will dissociate from the hateful ways of those who have arched his back. He is the witness of his own choice, and I hope may not be left alone to play the rôle of the "wise man" who "alters quickly"—or, say in five years, when he finds his predilections at variance with reality, and his conclusions at last the same as those of LIVINGSTONE.

Your obedient servant,

HORACE WALLER.

EAST LISS, HANTS, Oct. 30.

REPLY TO MR. WALLER'S LETTER.

IN reply to the Rev. HORACE WALLER'S excellent letter, the *Pall Mall Gazette* of 7th November published a long wordy article from its "Special African Correspondent," which is too diffuse and too full of absurdities to reprint in full ; but we give one of his impracticable schemes as a specimen.

We would call attention to the fact, that the writer boldly states that he protests against the *Abolition of Domestic Slavery* ! This alone is sufficient to show that he is of foreign nationality ; whilst our readers probably are aware that the newspaper in which this strange un-English article is published is owned in the United States of America. The Editor is a well-

known Englishman, formerly a Member of Parliament, but probably he has not full control.

* * * "The Anti-Slavery Societies will probably object to my scheme, that they cannot become traders. If such is their objection, there is another system that they might adopt, and that would secure the same end. Let them subsidize a certain number of men of unimpeachable honesty on the condition that they will establish a trading station within a distance of at least 150 miles of any existing trading station, and on the condition that they shall build at least fifty miles of road yearly from their station, and that they shall sell their goods at a certain maximum price. A sum of £200 to start with, and a further yearly subsidy of £100 during the next three years, would enable any steady man to carry out the plan and to build himself up a good position for the future. £6,000 down and a yearly amount of £2,000 during three years would be sufficient to start twenty such stations, and would mean one thousand miles of roads yearly opened out in the heart of Africa. At the same time the plan would prove the means of helping some deserving fellows in this country. These men would hear of, and report to the nearest military station, any Slave caravan passing through the country; they would give employment to the natives, enable them to buy goods, and thus prevent them from having to wage war against their neighbours in order to secure Slaves for the purchase of the necessaries of life.

"As to the Arabs, I maintain that they are most useful members of the African community, provided that they are kept under proper control. Mr. WALLER does not seem to have understood what I referred to when I quoted Mr. H. H. JOHNSTON'S opinion. I never said a word of his views with regard to the Arabs; I referred to his opinion on free natives from the Mombasa Mission in opposition with the Zanzibar Slaves. Mr. WALLER complains that I ask for "the most up-to-date facts," but I also want facts that bear on the point at issue, and he has taken us altogether out of it. *Domestic Slavery* is the important question; it is against its abolition that I protest, not because I consider its existence as a perfect institution, but because it can be replaced by nothing better, and also because its suppression would be disastrous to the freed Slaves themselves, and would constitute a grave danger to the Zanzibar Protectorate."—*Pall Mall Gazette*, November 7, 1895.

The International Law Association and Slavery.

To the Editor of "THE ANTI-SLAVERY REPORTER."

DEAR SIR,—Your readers will, I think, like to have some report of the discussion which took place, on the subject of Slavery in European Protectorates in Africa, at the recent Conference of the International Law Association, held at Brussels the beginning of this month. The Conference was attended by a number of distinguished jurists and other influential persons from Great Britain, the United States, and various Continental States. Her Majesty's Attorney-General, Sir RICHARD WEBSTER, was President of the Conference, and BARON LAMBERMONT, Belgian Minister of State, who so ably presided over the Brussels Anti-Slavery Conference of 1889-90, was Honorary President. Both were present at the discussion of this question.

Having read to the Conference the interesting and able paper kindly prepared for me by Mr. TEALL, which I hope you will be able to reproduce

in the *Reporter*, reviewing the progress made under the Brussels Convention, I moved the Resolution appended to this letter. The Association was reminded that, at its Milan Conference in 1883, Senhor NABUCO, the distinguished Brazilian abolitionist, brought forward a series of resolutions on the subject, which, after careful revision by a strong representative Committee, were unanimously adopted by the Conference. At that time Slavery was still recognised in Brazil as a legal institution, and the general scope of the resolutions was to declare that, in international relations, the status of Slavery ought not to be recognised. The second resolution enunciated the pregnant truth, on which the whole of them were based, that "Slavery [is] contrary to natural law." In view of the development of international law since 1883, as evidenced by the declarations contained in the General Acts of the Berlin and Brussels Conferences, the Association was now asked to take a step in advance, and to call upon the European nations, which have divided amongst them the protectorate of the greater part of Africa, to refuse to recognise the status of Slavery in their own protectorates.

The resolution was seconded by Dr. EVANS DARBY, and supported by the Chevalier DESCAMPS, Senator of Belgium, who was one of the Belgian Delegates at Cardinal LAVIGERIE's Anti-Slavery Conference in Paris, and who presided last summer at the Inter-Parliamentary Peace Congress in Brussels. M. DESCAMPS stated that the resolution is on the same lines as the new law on the subject adopted by the Congo State, which forbids the recognition of Slavery as a status giving rise to any difference of rights between one man and another. It thus appears that the Congo Free State has gone ahead of Great Britain as regards the non-recognition of Slavery in its African Protectorates. Surely this will shame Great Britain into insisting that Zanzibar law shall not maintain a distinction between bondman and freeman which Congo law has abolished! M. DESCAMPS also referred to the express declarations made by the late LORD VIVIAN, British Plenipotentiary at the Brussels Anti-Slavery Conference, that Slavery must not be recognised, either directly or indirectly, and that Great Britain could not be a party to any other position than this.

Both M. DESCAMPS and Mr. FOX BOURNE, who also supported the resolution, expressed satisfaction with the final clause of the resolution, pointing to a simple change in the law, without any direct or violent interference with domestic customs. The latter stated that, according to information received by him from West Africa, there have been cases in some of the British Colonies where harm has been done by injudicious action in the direction of almost compelling Slaves, who were quite content with their position, to leave their masters.

It is perhaps to be regretted that this aspect of the policy advocated by the ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY as regards Slavery in Zanzibar and Pemba has not been more prominently placed before the public. It was not, I think, at all referred to in the recent Mansion House meeting. The precedent which the Society has repeatedly urged upon Her Majesty's Government, that of the abolition of Slavery in India, is of the greatest possible value in this respect. An interesting account of the origin of the measure by which this reform was effected is given in Mr. HYSLOP BELL's biography of the late JOSEPH PEASE, the great-uncle of our President. By the stroke of a pen this great measure (now superseded by the provisions of the Indian Civil Code), put an end to all difference between the free and the slave population throughout the territories of the East India Company. It has, I believe, since been adopted in all the Native States of India. No proclamation of

emancipation was issued ; no Slave was invited to forsake his master's employ ; the courts of law were simply enjoined to treat all disputes arising between masters and servants on the footing that the servant was just as much entitled to civil rights and to the protection of the law as his master. And thus Slavery silently disappeared from the land, without any convulsion whatever. That is what, if I rightly understand the Society's proposals, we want to see in Zanzibar. We do not want any Slave who is at present well and fairly treated to be, as it were, dismissed, or even invited to depart, by the action of the Government. We only propose that, if a Slave is badly used by his master, he may leave that master without being detained under any legal sanction, and that he may have the same right to demand his wages as the master has to claim that he should work for those wages. This consideration seems to me of itself to dispose of all idea of compensation, seeing that it would be only those masters who treated their servants badly who would be likely to lose their services ; and it would be manifestly preposterous to claim compensation for bad masters and none for good ones.

I am glad to say that the resolution was unanimously adopted by the Conference at Brussels.

"Resolution.—This Association, re-affirming the principle laid down at its Milan Conference in 1883, that Slavery is contrary to natural law, expresses the desire that all European nations should, in their African possessions and protectorates, cease to recognise Slavery as a status implying the deprivation of legal rights, and should thus put an end to Slavery, and to the cruel Slave raids by which it is fed, without any violent subversion of existing domestic institutions."

Yours truly,

JOSEPH G. ALEXANDER.

33, CHANCERY LANE, LONDON, W.C., *October 26th, 1895.*

THE BRUSSELS ANTI-SLAVERY CONVENTION.

1890 TO 1895 IN AFRICA.

MR. JOSEPH G. ALEXANDER said—

The following review of Anti-Slavery work, under the Brussels General Act of 1890, has been kindly prepared for me by Mr. J. EASTOE TEALL, Assistant Secretary of the BRITISH AND FOREIGN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY, in view of the fact that the Annual Conference of this Association takes place this year in the city which was so appropriately selected as that of the Anti-Slavery Conference five years ago.

Five years have now elapsed since the signature of the General Act of the Brussels Conference—an Act which has not inaptly been termed the "Magna Charta" of the African race. Sufficient time has therefore gone by for an impartial examination and friendly criticism of the initial measures which have been taken by those of the Signatory Powers which have acquired territory in Africa, either by direct annexation or by the method euphemistically styled "assumption of the Protectorate."

During the period under consideration vast tracts of territory have come under the control of the great Powers ; so that for all practical purposes it may be taken that almost the whole of the African Continent is now, more or less, the dependency of some European state.

With the gradual occupation of these newly-acquired territories, measures largely connected with the establishment of authority have been promulgated, such as the prohibition or limitation to Europeans of the traffic in arms and ammunition, to which have been added regulations with respect to the importation of intoxicating liquors. These measures, however, do not come within the scope of the present paper, and will no doubt be dealt with by competent persons.

It is hoped that the following brief outline of the measures adopted by the Powers in the territories under their control will prove of interest, and call forth from the present Conference a reiteration of its former resolutions against the institution of Slavery.

THE CONGO STATE.

Since 1891 the authorities of this State have extended their power far into the interior of Africa. At that date the furthest stations occupied were Stanley Falls and Lusambo. In 1894 many chains of posts were in existence along the Rivers Welle and Aruwimi, across Manyema and Katanga, up to the furthest frontiers of the possession. Parallel with this extension of power has progressed the establishment of judicial administration, for whereas five years ago the action of regular justice was confined to the Lower Congo; at the present time magistrates are also to be found exercising jurisdiction in the Upper Congo, notably at Leopoldville and Nouvelle-Anvers. A stringent measure against Slave-raiding, involving the infliction of the capital penalty in special cases, and of fine and imprisonment in others, has been passed, and enforced on several occasions. The flotilla has been increased from eleven to nineteen vessels, and the construction of a railway between Matadi and Stanley Pool is steadily progressing. Initial measures for establishing telegraphic communication have been carried into effect.

Missionaries have been protected, agricultural and professional colonies have been organised by the State for the education and maintenance of liberated Slave boys.

Girls who have been liberated or abandoned find an asylum in special establishments, directed by Sisters, which have been founded by private benevolence under the patronage of the Government.

FRANCE.

The objection by France to agree to certain clauses of the General Act with respect to the grant of the flag to native vessels, to the crew list, and manifest of negro passengers, etc., left this question as it was before the passing of the Act, although subsequently in a *note verbale* that Power agreed to spontaneously apply such clauses herself in the territory of Oboch, and according to necessity in Madagascar and the Comoro Islands. The abuse of the French flag by the Arabs has, however, continued, and in one case, whilst the Slaves were taken out and liberated at Zanzibar, the vessel and crew, which had been sent for trial to Réunion, were acquitted.

In the French establishments on the African mainland one is pleased to find marks of progress, notably in the **Gulf of Benin**, where the laws of France respecting judicial administration and police have been applied, as well as the law against the Slave-trade, of March, 1831, whilst in treaties with some of the native tribes clauses abolishing the traffic in Slaves and human sacrifices have been inserted. Many thousands of Slaves who had sought the protection of the French flag have been declared free and sent back to their country of origin.

In the **French Soudan** "liberty villages" have been formed in the neighbourhood of each post, where Slaves, liberated from caravans, or who have sought refuge

under the flag, are placed. The masters of escaped Slaves have three months to reclaim them. Failing to do so, the Slave is entitled to a certificate of liberty.

In **French Guinea** some of the Slaves have been liberated, but it is to be regretted that the authorities have not carried out the law of the Republic as to Slavery, and have favoured a system of ransom which is much to be deprecated.

GERMANY.

Although the penal code of the Empire is declared to be binding in the German Protectorates in Africa, yet various local measures have been passed so far as Slavery and the Slave-trade are concerned, which it is impossible to reconcile with that code, for whereas under its provisions Slavery is unlawful, yet under the local laws that institution remains practically untouched. Here, too, a system of so-called "ransom" has been established, under which a Slave who has been transferred in any way to a European is entitled to his liberty, subject to the redemption by his services of the ransom-money. There can be little doubt that this system tends to stimulate the Slave-trade, and the German authorities cannot expect much progress to take place in their territory so long as they recognise Slavery as an institution. On the other hand, they are very strict in their endeavours to prevent the export of Slaves by sea. Steam communication on Lake Nyassa has been established, and the making of a railway in German East Africa is being undertaken.

ITALY.

In the Italian Colony of Eritrea very few Slaves are reported as having had recourse to the authorities, although they can obtain their liberty. The authorities believe that the Slaves are aware of the fact that they have the same rights before the law as their masters.

Independent testimony speaks favourably of the treatment of the natives, judicial and otherwise, by the Italian authorities. Here, too, a light railway has been constructed for a short distance into the interior.

SPAIN.

A Treaty, embodying the provisions of the Brussels Act, has been signed between Great Britain and Spain, in substitution for older Treaties.

PORTUGAL.

New laws have been passed for carrying into effect the Brussels Act in African territories.

GREAT BRITAIN.

Since the signature of the Brussels Act, England has assumed the Protectorate over Zanzibar, ceding to Germany the Colony of Heligoland, and recognising the Protectorate of France over Madagascar in return for the acquiescence of those Powers in her proceedings. But her Anti-Slavery policy of nearly three-quarters of a century has not been maintained. On the assumption of the Protectorate, instead of decreeing the abolition of Slavery, as in other Protectorates, the British authorities allowed the issue of a decree whereby the status of Slavery was recognised, and in some points strengthened.

The **BRITISH AND FOREIGN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY**, with the desire of ascertaining the true facts of the case, early in the present year despatched a Special Commissioner to inquire into the state of affairs in Zanzibar and its dependent Island of Pemba. His report shows that there are probably some 266,000 Slaves on the two islands, that they have no civil rights; that very few children are born to Slaves; that a considerable importation and reportation of Slaves still takes place; that the system of porters is

a branch of the traffic; and that great cruelty is sometimes practised, with a consequent exceedingly high death rate—in fact, the position of the Slaves is no better than it was before the advent of European control.

A Government "Gazette" is issued every week, and the Maritime Bureau, established by the Brussels Act, is in full operation. Regulations, as laid down in the Act, are carried out with respect to native dhows.

In **British Central Africa** much fighting has taken place with some of the leading native chiefs, who were also interested in the Slave-trade; but here, as in Zanzibar, no attempt has been made to abolish Slavery, whilst a form of ransom has been introduced by some of the Europeans, which is open to all the objections that have been raised to the system elsewhere. Steamers have been placed on the lake Nyasa, and regular postal communication has been established.

A newspaper appears at intervals, more or less frequent, and periodicals are issued from the various Mission presses.

In **British East Africa** the Company which was established some few years ago by philanthropic and commercial gentlemen in England, has been compelled to withdraw, and its territory has passed under direct Government control. In the province of Witu, Anti-Slavery measures which had been arranged by the Company with the native chiefs have been swept on one side, and Slavery remains just as it was before the Company commenced operations.

The projected railway from Mombasa to Lake Victoria, which is about to be constructed by the British Government, it is hoped will do much to substitute the iron for the human horse in that portion of Africa, and thus put an end to the system of portage, which is the cause of so much suffering and desolation.

The foregoing review is not altogether encouraging. The course of events has brought to light only too clearly the most serious defect of the Brussels Act. The resolutions unanimously adopted by the Milan Conference of this Association in 1883, laid down the important principle that the institution of Slavery is "contrary to natural law," and applied this principle to the various cases in which the status of Slavery comes in question in international relations. The Brussels Conference sought to destroy the Slave-trade, without directly attacking the institution of Slavery, which is the root of that traffic.

One cannot help asking the question: Is it not time that the European Powers should cease to tolerate so great an evil and an injustice as Slavery in any of the territories subject to their protection and control? Throughout the whole African Continent the system prevails, accompanied with all the horrors of the Slave-hunt, the Slave-march, and the Slave-market. Spasmodic attempts to crush Slave-hunting here, or to intercept caravans there, are of but little use, so long as the State authorities and others make use of the labour of Slaves, and acknowledge the right of man to hold property in his fellow man.

Surely the time has come when the courts of justice should be open to every individual member of each independent State, and Slavery as a status be unknown.

Through the dim ages has been handed down the maxim of the jurists of old: *Fiat justitia, ruat cælum!* It is for a continuation and expansion of the policy expressed in that maxim we plead, feeling convinced that the jurists of to-day will accept the trust which has been bequeathed to them by their forerunners, and demand at the hands of their respective nations that, at all cost, justice shall be done to every person dwelling beneath the protection of their flags.

Threatened Enslavement or Extermination of the Hindu-Kafir Tribes

ON this subject special attention is called to page 242 of this *Reporter*.

COLONEL HOLDICH states in *The Geographical Magazine* that he believes these Kafirs to be the modern representatives of the Nysæans—so ancient that the historians of Greece have forgotten them.

These are the interesting people whom the British Government of AFGHANISTAN has determined to exterminate or enslave. See *the Government of India* ! See page 242. (*The Reporter*).

See also stirring article on this question in the *Times* of 1896, by SIR LEPEL GRIFFIN, who proclaimed them to be a barbaric nation.

Very strong protests against this barbaric policy have been sent to the London, Country, and Indian press.

THE BRITISH AND FOREIGN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY, to protect the rights and interests of the Kafirs, has petitioned the Government. That the Kafirs were so captured, see page 242.

That the SOCIETY acted in their behalf is proved by the following:

Surely the SOCIETY will once more unite in the defence of an ancient but helpless nation, which has been inconsiderately handed over to the tender mercies of the British Government.

The Extinction of the Kafirs of the Du-kush.

to pages 241 to 248 in the present number of

Geographical Journal, January, 1896, that "he
representatives of that very ancient Western race,
ns of Alexander refer to their origin as mythical.

whom our largely subsidised ally, the AMEER OF
ate or enslave, *if he meets with no opposition from*
(*The Times.*)

question in the *Saturday Review* of January 18th,
ed the present Ameer as Ruler of Afghanistan.

barbarity have been made by powerful organs of

-SLAVERY SOCIETY is bound, by the terms of its
interests "OF ALL PERSONS CAPTURED AS SLAVES!"
e 242.

half in 1874 and 1878, see page 246.

ore use its influence with the Government, on
, which, by a late Treaty with Afghanistan, was
r mercies of its deadliest foe.





